

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of Warwick

<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap/34735>

This thesis is made available online and is protected by original copyright.

Please scroll down to view the document itself.

Please refer to the repository record for this item for information to help you to cite it. Our policy information is available from the repository home page.

ARCHITECTURE AT BURGHEY HOUSE:
THE PATRONAGE OF WILLIAM CECIL
1553-1598

3 VOLUMES

VOLUME 1	:	TEXT
VOLUME 2	:	TEXT
VOLUME 3	:	PLANS AND FIGURES
BOX	:	LOOSE PLANS

JILLIAN HUSSELBY

Submitted for the degree of
Ph.D., University of Warwick, April 1996

Research conducted in Department of History of Art,
University of Warwick

CONTENTS

	Page
<u>VOLUME 1</u>	
Acknowledgements	i.
Summary	ii.
List of Abbreviations	iii.
<u>Introduction</u>	1
<u>Chapter One</u> : William Cecil as Patron and Scholar	19
<u>Chapter Two</u> : The House of Cecil 1553-1566 : Part 1	72
<u>Chapter Three</u> : The House of Cecil 1553-1566 : Part 2	113
<u>Chapter Four</u> : Garden and Park : The Politics of Pleasure	148
<u>VOLUME 2</u>	
<u>Chapter Five</u> : "Beautiful Scenery" : The Courtyard as Stage	201
<u>Chapter Six</u> : Metamorphosis : The House of Burghley: Part 1 1573-1588	247
<u>Chapter Seven & Conclusion</u> : "Its Purpose is its Use" : The House of Burghley Part 2 and Conclusion	313
Bibliography	355
Appendix A	400
Appendix B	411
<u>VOLUME 3</u>	
Explanation of Numbering System for Plans and Figures	419
List of Plans and Figures	420
Plans	
Figures	
Box File : Loose Plans F1 - F10	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank all of the following, without whom this thesis would not have been possible. My Supervisor, Richard Morris for his generous and unflagging encouragement, advice and guidance throughout the research. The British Academy for a three-year studentship bursary. The Burghley House Preservation Trust for permission for me to make this study, and to Mr J. M Scott, Agent to Burghley Estate at the time, for approaching the Trustees on my behalf. Lady Victoria Leatham for her positive response to the idea of the study and for kindly allowing access to the private as well as more public part of the house. Jon Culverhouse, House Manager of Burghley House, and his wife, Sarah for an enormous amount of help, knowledgeable guidance and time and their consecutive assistants, Charles Pugh, Nicholas Humphry and Maria Flemmington. Ken Wooley at the Burghley Estate Office. Alan Wilson, Honorary Architect to Burghley House (who retired in 1994), for expert information, encouragement and help and for allowing me to draw on information and reproduce plans from his excellent record of the house. Dr Eric Till, Honorary Archivist, again for expertise and advice from his unrivalled knowledge of the history of the house and the Cecil family. RCHME for the timely undertaking of the measured survey of the ground floor, and in particular to John Bold, Nicholas Cooper and George Wilson for all their help. All the members of the History of Art Department and Photographic Department of Warwick University. The Marquess of Salisbury for kindly allowing access to the archives at Hatfield and to Robin Harcourt Williams, Librarian and Archivist to the Marquess of Salisbury, for patient assistance and expert advice on the documents. Amongst many others scholars who have helped me in this research I also want to thank particularly Brian Dix, Bruce Bailey, Tony Baggs, Clare Gapper, Doreen Agutter, Professor Krista de Jonge, Diana Sutherland and Alan Dawn for their expertise and specialist knowledge generously shared. Lynne Wright, Mathew Fattorini, Malachi Smyth, and Suzie Donkin for their invaluable help in typing, correcting and assembling the text and illustrations for the thesis and Joan Horsley for unfailing support throughout. Above all to my husband, Bill, and our children for living with William Cecil for so long.

SUMMARY

William Cecil held office for the first forty years of Queen Elizabeth's reign, and was the most powerful man in England for most of that time. He was also its most important architectural patron. Not only was he the builder of three great houses, one of which was to become a royal palace, he also played a leading role in the direction of state architecture undertaken by the Office of the Royal Works. Architecturally and historically therefore Burghley, his only surviving house, holds an important position.

Research has focused on extending the knowledge of the building history and how this information can contribute to the understanding of the relationship between patron and building in patron-led architectural process. Above all, it stresses how the end product of this process was designed to function for the purposes of its political master. In the historiography of the period Cecil's patronage has been stereotyped within the persistently low estimation of architectural patronage in England. Consequently his architectural experience, educational background and intellectual stature, all of which bear comparison with major contemporary European patrons, have tended to be marginalized, and the more complex aspects of the architectural results to be overlooked.

The broader context of Cecil's overlapping private and institutional cultural patronage is explored to establish a profile of its nature and the role of Burghley House in his political strategy. New documentary evidence, some in Cecil's own hand, has allowed a more precise understanding of Cecil as the principal intelligence directing and determining the building's form and plan. Analysis of the archaeology of the standing fabric in conjunction with RCHME's new measured plan of the ground floor has unlocked a number of the mysteries of its architectural history, and revealed the sixteenth-century house as a remarkably lucid architectural entity in the concept of its form and plan.

Burghley House has emerged as an important, if not seminal building in the development of the country house as a response to the changing pattern of hospitality, self-consciously designed for visiting peer groups and the corporate entertaining of the queen and court. Its context is that of the imported court culture, as much as of the Northamptonshire landscape. The sophisticated classical courtyard architecture with its imperial iconography drawn from classical literature reflects this duality. So too does the development of deer park and gardens simultaneously with the house. The evidence further suggests that the whole environment was planned not only as the ideal socio-political amenity, but as a visually as well as physically inter-related complex.

ABBREVIATIONS

<u>AH</u>	<u>Architectural History</u>
<u>AJ</u>	<u>Architectural Journal</u>
<u>Antiq. Jnl</u>	<u>Antiquaries Journal</u>
<u>AR</u>	<u>Architectural Review</u>
<u>Arch</u>	<u>Archaeologia</u>
<u>BAAJ</u>	<u>British Archaeological Association Journal</u>
<u>BHPT</u>	<u>Burghley House Preservation Trust</u>
<u>BL</u>	<u>British Library</u>
<u>BM</u>	<u>British Museum</u>
<u>Burl. Mag.</u>	<u>Burlington Magazine</u>
<u>Cal PR Ed. IV</u>	<u>Calendar of Patent Rolls Edward IV</u>
<u>Cal SP Dom.</u>	<u>Calendar of State Papers Domestic</u>
<u>CL</u>	<u>Country Life</u>
<u>DNB</u>	<u>Dictionary of National Biography</u>
<u>EcHR</u>	<u>Economic History Review</u>
<u>EHR</u>	<u>English Historical Review</u>
<u>Gents Mag.</u>	<u>Gentleman's Magazine</u>
<u>HMC</u>	<u>Historical Manuscripts Commission</u>
<u>King's Works</u>	<u>History of the King's Works</u>
<u>L&P</u>	<u>Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-1547</u>
<u>MPF</u>	<u>Maps, Plans, Folios</u>
<u>NMR</u>	<u>National Monuments Record</u>
<u>NNQ</u>	<u>Northamptonshire Notes and Queries</u>
<u>NS</u>	<u>New Series</u>
<u>NRS</u>	<u>Northamptonshire Records Society</u>
<u>P & P</u>	<u>Past and Present</u>
<u>PRO</u>	<u>Public Records Office</u>
<u>Proc. SA</u>	<u>Proceedings of the Society of Antiquaries</u>
<u>RCHME</u>	<u>Royal Commission on Historical Monuments, England</u>
<u>Ren and Mod St.</u>	<u>Renaissance and Modern Studies</u>
<u>RIBA</u>	<u>Royal Institute of British Architects</u>
<u>RHS Trans.</u>	<u>Royal Historical Society Transactions</u>
<u>SMR</u>	<u>Sites and Monuments Record</u>
<u>STC</u>	<u>Short Title Catalogue</u>
<u>VCH</u>	<u>Victoria History of the Counties of England</u>
<u>WCJ</u>	<u>Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes</u>

INTRODUCTION

At the first meeting of her Council, three days after Elizabeth I was proclaimed queen on 17 November 1558, she appointed William Cecil as Principal Secretary and Privy Councillor by her personal charge. He was to hold the chief offices of state for the next forty years until his death in 1598. He was the most powerful man in England during almost the entire reign. This longevity of office is in itself remarkable and has no equivalent in British history.

Cecil's position was always carefully subordinated to that of the queen, but his influence over almost every aspect of the nation's life was profound, and with regard to architecture he was the most important patron of the second half of the sixteenth century. He became the dominant high-ranking figure involved in the whole state building programme administered through the Office of the Royal Works. Here the greatest expenditure was on strategic engineering projects and defence - fields from which the impetus of technical and structural innovation in European architecture were emanating in the sixteenth century. Under Protector Somerset in Edward VI's reign the lead in domestic architecture, which was by far the most important form of secular building throughout Europe in the sixteenth century, had already passed from monarch to courtier in England. This pattern was sustained during Elizabeth's monarchy and Cecil took up the initiative in the development of the great house at Burghley in Northamptonshire, Cecil House in London, and Theobalds in Hertfordshire, the three most influential centres of courtier building in the period.

Cecil's personal buildings were themselves designed to play a powerful role in the political strategies of this supremely ambitious man whose success and fortune largely depended on those of the monarch and the state which her public persona embodied. Burghley, as his only surviving house, thus holds a key historical and architectural

position, and its significance in the narrower architectural context can be closely related to its significance within the broader historical picture. It was one of the earliest of a new order of houses, self-consciously planned from the outset by Cecil as a 'hospitality centre' for the entertainment of the corporate body of the monarch and her court.

Cecil might refer to Burghley as "my cottage" but there is little evidence to suggest that it was intended as a private retreat.¹ Its scale, style, imperial iconography, (identified through the research for this thesis), plan and surrounding gardens and deer park confirm its rationale as an environment intended for the political entertainment of the queen and court.

"I must also speak of the kind of house that I would approve for a man of the first rank who has achieved political honours. Its purpose is its use."² As with so much of his political strategy, Cecil appears to have followed Cicero's advice with regard to his houses, and it is the premise that "its purpose is its use" which has been central to the research, analysis and interpretation of Burghley House. How did the design of this great house set in the Northamptonshire countryside, on the edge of the little town of Stamford, relate to its cosmopolitan patron and to the imported micro-culture of the queen and her court? It was, moreover, a court in which the courtier had become "an international figure" by the middle of the sixteenth century.³ The second half of that century was to be a period of intense diplomatic activity, and progress visits could also provide the occasion for the queen to undertake lavish entertainments laid on for foreign emissaries.⁴

Like the mansions of other great political magnates in Europe, Cecil's houses were freed from a traditional defensive role and became the topoi for a different order of power, for 'jaw jaw' not 'war war', acting as vehicles for demonstrating the idea of civilizing power conceptually and through the splendour and management of the hospitality, rather than by show of force. Neither Cecil nor his monarch were military leaders. As he

advised his son Robert, soldiery as a mechanism of power "is a science no longer in request ...soldiers in peace are like chimneys in Summer".⁵ Cecil's science was political and his houses were his personal power bases, although always carefully positioned as reflections of the queen's rulership.

Unlike Theobalds and Cecil House, Burghley was remote from the principal standing centre of the court and administration at the adjacent palaces of Whitehall and Westminster. It was, however, on the peripatetic agenda of the progress tours.⁶ It was also the house from which Cecil chose to take his title in 1571, and to which his personal identity was always most closely bound. "My principal house" and my house "of Burghley" were how he referred to it, whereas he merely had houses "at Theobalds" and "in Westminster".⁷ In the event of a visit, the manner in which that identity would be perceived by monarch and court, and possibly members of a wider international audience, was of crucial interest for him.

What has so far been established of the overall architectural history of Burghley is most fully set out by Hussey in his well-researched series of articles in Country Life (1953),⁸ and by Pevsner, who agrees with Hussey in almost every respect, in the Peterborough section of the Buildings of England (1968).⁹ Much of the documentation concerning the sixteenth-century history is from the same sources as first published by Gotch in the Royal Institute of British Architects' Transactions (1890), or cited by him in other pioneering works on Burghley, the Renaissance in Northamptonshire and throughout England.¹⁰ Hussey and Pevsner, however, write in the light of Summerson's discovery, published in 1949, that John Thorpe's birthdate precluded him from involvement with original designs for Burghley.¹¹

Pevsner gives a brief background of William Cecil followed by an outline of the stylistic context of Burghley in relation to other houses similarly built by those influenced by Somerset and his circle, as well as to earlier buildings in the native Gothic tradition,

such as Richmond, Greenwich and Thornbury. The French-inspired Renaissance architecture, evident in the courtyard and Roman stair and in motifs employed throughout the house, is seen as a natural evolution of ideas introduced by the Somerset circle during Edward VI's reign, combined with more Flemish influences, possibly including work undertaken by the Dutch mason "Hendrik", which Cecil imported directly from Antwerp.¹² Meanwhile, the reasoning behind the more traditional "Gothic" aspects of the building such as the vault of the west entrance dated 1577, is interpreted as an expression of Cecil's desire, as Hussey describes it, "to impart an ancestral character to his 'seat of Barony'".¹³

Following the résumé of its history, Pevsner gives a topographical description of the exterior of the house which, aside from Gandy Deering's remodelling of the courtyard in the nineteenth century, is mostly regarded as of sixteenth-century origin. Apart from the great hall, discussion of the interior is almost entirely of the seventeenth-century decoration and furnishings.

Two building phases under Cecil are identified, the first from c.1553-1564 and the second from the mid 1570s to 1587, separated by a period when Cecil was concentrating on the new house at Theobalds. On stylistic grounds both Hussey and Pevsner ascribe the present great hall/kitchen range to the early phase of Cecil's building, citing references in letters to Cecil from his officers on site in the 1550s and 1560s published by Gotch.¹⁴ Girouard, in his article 'Elizabethan Architecture and the Gothic Tradition' in Architectural History (1963), put forward the now generally accepted dating of this range to Cecil's later building phase. As he points out, details of the hall given in the letters mean they cannot in fact refer to the present great hall, and he argues instead a date of 1578 (although I argue c. 1573 as a more likely dating).¹⁵ Girouard proposed a more widespread re-interpretation of this phase of Elizabethan architecture whereby patrons made a conscious stylistic decision away from Classical architecture, resulting in a chosen style which was

"pre-eminently a development from a living Gothic tradition"¹⁶ which at Burghley succeeded the earlier Classical phase of Cecil's building campaign.

In two brief articles in Country Life (1992) Girouard has himself revised his views of 1963 in the light of new research.¹⁷ He now considers that almost nothing from the first building phase survives and "that the house was almost entirely remodelled between about 1572 and '87; and that the surviving traditional and Classical elements date from this period" This is interpreted as reflecting a more complex situation in which "Burghley becomes the equivalent in architecture of the Elizabethan settlement in religion and politics".¹⁸ Its synthesis of styles is seen as reflecting on the one hand Cecil's personal respect for native tradition, and on the other his scholarly humanist background and possible descent from "Roman nobles, Greek and Trojan kings and even Classical Gods."¹⁹

Other important work on Burghley includes Till's article 'Capability Brown at Burghley' in Country Life (1975). As a result of new documentary material discovered at the house, Till has established much of the nature and extent of Brown's work on the house for the first time. This included hitherto overlooked changes to the south front which, together with discussion of the seventeenth-century remodelling of this front in the article, are extremely useful in clarifying what has taken place since the sixteenth century. Lady Victoria Leatham's Burghley. The Life of a Great House (1992) gives a fascinating account of her ancestors and of aspects of life in the house from the sixteenth century to the present day. Her researches have led to numerous new discoveries regarding the history and provenance of pictures, items of furniture, porcelain, and other objets in the house. Most of these, however, even if of the sixteenth century, were collected by the 5th Earl (1648-1700) and his heiress wife, or by later generations of Cecils.

The thesis does not seek to argue with the fundamentals of what has been established of the building history of Burghley in the sixteenth century by major scholars of

the period and later, although there are differences in interpretation. However, Girouard's articles of 1992 have been the only publication devoted solely to the sixteenth-century development of the house by William Cecil to have appeared in the past thirty years. A number of reasons can perhaps account for this apparent neglect. Firstly, the known documentary evidence which has been considered to be directly relevant to the history of the house in the sixteenth century is by no means extensive, and no new documents from the period of similar importance to those published by Gotch have hitherto been discovered. Secondly, Burghley lies outside the principal remit of Girouard's study of Robert Smythson and the Elizabethan Country House and the resulting concentration of interest in the emerging role of the professional 'architect' in the period which this has stimulated. Thirdly, whereas Longleat, the other surviving great house contemporary with Burghley, is seen as "so seminal a point of reference for the history of the country house",²⁰ Burghley's position in architectural history has been viewed as an exciting, "extraordinarily impressive creation" but nevertheless a far less widely significant individual marvel, the epitome of "insular individuality".²¹ In surveys of the architecture of the period it is Theobalds which is customarily seen as Cecil's more innovative and influential building.²² Within a narrowly stylistic history therefore, Burghley has been allotted an assured but relatively marginal place.

So what, it may be asked, now justifies a thesis devoted to William Cecil's creation of Burghley House? As Howard has recently summarized in The Tudor and Jacobean Great House (1994), in the past few decades there have been major advances in the scholarship of architectural history of the period both in terms of the use of new materials as evidence and of new methods of research, resulting in some significant new discoveries as well as certain re-evaluations of long-established views.²³ There are also new key areas of interest which have developed within the discipline. These include, for example, evidence which contributes to our understanding of the role and status of women within the household; the siting and surroundings of the house and the widespread increase of attention to every aspect of garden history; the dynamics of the plan in relationship to

function and specific patterns of social behaviour, and overall, the importance of architecture as "evidence of social, political and intellectual, as well as architectural, history".²⁴ All of these developments open up new potential for research on Burghley and its influential patron, and thereby of contributing to the knowledge of the history and significance of 'the country house' as a phenomenon.

What the thesis does therefore seek to do is to employ new materials and methods to bring the research on Burghley House into line with modern scholarship. The aim thereby is to extend and broaden the understanding of its history in the manner which has proved so fruitful in studies of other houses, such as Drury's work on Audley End and Hill Hall and Smith's investigations in Hertfordshire.²⁵

The circumstances of the house preclude the use of invasive archaeological techniques employing modern scientific analysis at Burghley; nor is it possible by and large to examine what lies behind the seventeenth-century decoration which covers most above-ground areas of the interior of the sixteenth-century fabric.²⁶ Nevertheless, a close study of the archaeology of the standing fabric (based on empirical observation) in conjunction with the Royal Commission on Historic Monuments England's new measured plan of the ground floor has produced a significant amount of new evidence and unlocked a number of the previous mysteries of its architectural history.

Girouard's recent articles, including the research on iconography at Burghley which had been hitherto ignored, may themselves serve as examples of what can be learnt from a previously neglected source of evidence.²⁷ The thesis affords the opportunity to examine such sources in greater depth, and in the context of the powerful political motivations which lay behind the extravagant genealogical associations identified by Girouard, not only for Cecil himself, but for the Tudor monarchy.²⁸ What from a twentieth-century perspective may appear to be exotic if not absurd claims to antique ancestry were used as propaganda by most of the ruling houses of Europe in the sixteenth

century. Burghley 'the place' is important for understanding, in a more complex manner than hitherto, the nature of how Burghley 'the man' chose to fashion his own image in relation to the monarch, and as a reflection of the monarch, in the form articulated in the speech by "Place" during the queen's visit to Harefield in 1602:

"Weare I as large as there harts that are mine Owners, I should be the fairest Pallace in the world; and weere I agreeable to the wishes of there hartes, I should in some measure resemble her sacred selfe, and be in the outward frount exceeding faire, and in the inward furniture exceeding rich".²⁹

This self-fashioning process also makes a closer analysis of Cecil's patronage at Burghley an important aspect of the wider political history of the period. No biography of William Cecil has appeared since Beckingsale's of 1967. Read's two part biography, published in 1955 and 1960, remains the most comprehensive work on the most powerful male figure of Elizabeth's reign. In Read's view Cecil could not "justly be regarded as a patron of the arts, except architecture."³⁰ Beckingsale's chapter on Cecil's patronage of the arts and learning however, demonstrates his widespread involvement and contribution to almost every aspect of the cultural life of the nation, while the chapter on Cecil as "Lord and Dynast" gives an overview of Cecil's aspirations and long-term ambitions for the Cecil dynasty. Barnett's Place, Profit and Power: A study of the Servants of William Cecil (1969) affords valuable insights into the organisation of Cecil's households and the nature and calibre of those he employed, but again this was published more than twenty-five years ago. There have since been major developments in the scholarship of the period not only in architectural history but in the fields of social and cultural history, as well as a general re-focusing towards a more inter-disciplinary approach in all aspects of historical research. Events such as the conference on "Albion's Classicism" in 1993, and the series of colloques held at Tours surveying particular aspects of Renaissance architecture throughout Europe and the resulting publications, have acted as new, broadly-based international forums for modern scholarship. Papers published from the 1988 colloque for instance,

indicate the growing interest in the interior planning and organisation of great houses and palaces, and have demonstrated how much the analysis of individual buildings can reveal about the rituals and patterns of social and political behaviour which they accommodated. Certain of the studies also show how the architecture and disposition of a building could be used to shape as well as to frame the behaviour of its occupants and their guests.³¹

Cecil's great houses are central to such discourses. The use of Cecil House and Theobalds as the venues not only for royal visits, but for staging top-level diplomatic meetings and entertainments for foreign embassies, is well documented.³² Hospitality was employed as an important mechanism of international as well as national politics throughout Europe in the period,³³ and Cecil was assiduous in planning every detail of the logistics of the events which he hosted.³⁴ By the time he embarked on the second building phase at Burghley he was the most experienced political host in the country. The fitness for its purpose of the environment he created at Theobalds is manifest in the preamble to the Act of Parliament passed when King James took it in exchange for Hatfield 1607:

"as well as for situation in a good and open aire, and for the large and goodlie buildings, and delight of the gardens, walkes, and park replenished with redd fallowe deere, as alsoe for the neereness to the cittie of London northwards, and to his Majesties Forest of Waltham Chase and Parke of Enfield, with comoditie of a navigable river falling into the Thames, is a place so convenient for his Majesties princely sportes and recreation, and so commodious for the residence of his Highnes Court and entertaynment of forrayne Princes or their ambassadors, upon all occasions..."³⁵

Burghley, although not convenient for London, shared most of these amenities. The first phase of Cecil's development of the house was already nearing completion before the property on which he was to build Theobalds was even purchased, and from the outset

at Burghley he was creating extensive gardens and landscaping a deer park in conjunction with re-fashioning and extending the house to suit his ambitions.

The subject of progress visits has been well researched³⁶ and presents a specific and fascinating seasonal aspect of what Thurley has termed the "liturgy" of the monarch's existence.³⁷ Studies of these visits have also contributed a great deal to the knowledge of Elizabethan architecture. The plan and the organisation of the whole environment of house garden and park at Burghley are analysed from the perspective of their intended function as a venue for the queen and court and how they might serve to enhance the visual, dramatic and sporting spectacles that were such important features in the politics of staging these events.

There have been major studies of aspects of the 'domestic' architecture of the period, for instance, of the staircase, the long gallery, the state apartments and the garden buildings;³⁸ but surprisingly there has been no full-length study taking together the development of a great house with its garden and park in the sixteenth century, in the manner, for instance, of Saumarez Smith's The Building of Castle Howard (1990). Yet these are the combined elements which constitute the idea of a 'country house' as opposed to a 'house in the country'.

How then do current ideas as to the nature of the 'country house' differ from or coincide with William Cecil's perception of the entity? In many ways, couched within its ostensibly traditional outward appearance, aspects of Burghley are radical developments in the whole concept of its use and purpose. Some of these were quickly absorbed, first as fashionable features of courtier houses then gradually filtering outwards to the lesser country houses of the gentry. The classical loggia, which first appears fully-fledged as an integral part of the main body of the house at Burghley, is a case in point. The clearly-defined division of the house into private and public areas is another. The panache of each of the stairways, both equally innovative within English architecture, and though

entirely different from one another, both placed within matching angle pavilions of the building, constitute major developments in form and planning. Other internal innovations, which new research has revealed were introduced in Cecil's first building phase, are not known in private houses until the seventeenth century. They include a fully integrated, well-appointed guest lodging block and an extensive suite designated for Mildred Cecil which contained a gallery, in the manner of female accommodation previously confined to royal households. The symmetry of the plan of the western end of the house also presages developments usually assigned to the Stuart period when "what might be called the Palladian principle, the extension of symmetry as a principle to the interior layout as well as the exterior facade" is first perceived.³⁹ There are also indications of an awareness of what Wittkower has called "the optical element of architecture",⁴⁰ again a sophistication which in English architecture has been associated first with Inigo Jones. The audience for a sixteenth century house was continually on the move through the parade route. If it was static, attention was focussed on the mobile human spectacles of the rituals of court routine. The plan of the public circuit of Burghley appears to have been organised with this in mind, so that a sequential series of vistas opened up as the audience processed.⁴¹ The most tangible material evidence of the architecture being adjusted to the eye is in the differing profiles of the stringcourse mouldings. As can be most obviously seen on the turrets of the west gate-tower, those of the courtyard fronts, where the architecture was to be experienced at relatively close quarters, are more refined and project less than those of the outward facing facades. Here the deeper, bolder profiles cast stronger shadows so that the horizontal articulation of the building registers even when viewed from a considerable distance.⁴² All of these examples of innovations can be seen in terms of response to, or rather anticipation of, the intended purpose of the building.

The research into William Cecil's patronage and the architecture of Burghley has set out to investigate how Burghley was designed to work under these circumstances both physically and metaphysically. It has focussed not only on extending the knowledge of the building history but also on how this information can contribute to the understanding of

the relationship between patron and building in a patron-led architectural process. Because of Cecil's political position, this relationship has a significance beyond the particularity of Burghley House, and is relevant to wider issues concerning the nature of cultural patronage, both private and institutional, and how this related to contemporary sixteenth-century architectural patronage in Europe. More specific issues arise, such as the aesthetic apprehension of 'natural' landscape and the intentions of the landscaping of the park which Cecil was undoubtedly undertaking from the mid-1550s; so too does the question of an attitude towards classical architecture employed in a far more complex manner than the mere adoption of a fashionable European style.

Despite the volume of Cecil's surviving papers, the majority of the more personal items previously consulted consists of correspondence addressed to him. Two key papers, directly concerning Burghley and in Cecil's own hand, have enabled a much more detailed idea of the first phase of his building campaign at the house to be formulated. They have also allowed a more precise reading of his role as the principal intellect behind the building of the house than the exclusively one-way correspondence previously drawn upon could provide.

As the architect and critic Alan Powers has observed, "to preserve the original vision to the end of a construction project without compromise is one of the most difficult things in architecture. Somebody, architect, client or user usually gets hurt in the process".⁴³ Powers is speaking of circumstances in the 1990s, but the dynamics of these often conflicting interests are the norms of conventional large-scale architectural undertakings which are not confined to the twentieth century. At Burghley, however, the interests of architect, client and user were primarily represented by one and the same man. Cecil made use of experienced architects and designers from the Royal Works and their creative contribution is not overlooked, but there is no evidence of a single major figure whose intellect and ego intervenes between this patron and his buildings.

The approach has therefore been on the premise that the architecture can more confidently be regarded as the "vision" of its patron than would be the case if an established individual 'career' architect was involved.⁴⁴ The vision encompasses not just the house, but the whole environment of Burghley House including the creation of the surrounding gardens and park.

This approach raises further issues. How, for example, do a patron's ambitions for his building differ from those of a 'career' architect, and should one apply a different hierarchy of criteria in assessing or interpreting the success of the architecture produced? The reasoning behind the building is seen as a complex historical issue. We are after all looking not at an abstract architectural object but a building with a potentially important political and social role, built by the consummate politician of the age who chose to make it his titular identity. There can be little doubt of the importance of this building to a man whose architectural experience in a professional capacity went well beyond the expectations one might have of an amateur patron in this, or almost any other period.

As the architecture has been analysed in close relation to its intended physical and metaphysical functions, an equal emphasis has been given in the research to the space enclosed and how it was planned and shaped, as to the wall architecture which encloses it. The unusual good fortune of having both ground and first-floor survey plans dating from the early seventeenth century has allowed this to be undertaken in much greater detail than is normally possible for a sixteenth-century palace or great house (Plans 1 & 2).

Looked at from this more three-dimensional perspective Burghley emerges as a remarkably lucid architectural structure in which many of the formerly inexplicable anomalies of the building are revealed not as inept or ignorant mistakes, but as the result of ambitious conceptions which could not be entirely realized. The overall architectural plan of Burghley can be seen in marked contrast, for instance, to "the huddle of little courts"⁴⁵ which lurk behind the "beautiful shell" of Longleat (Fig 0.1a, 0.1b).⁴⁶

The primary written documentary material used in the thesis is mostly from within the vast collection of State Papers held in the Public Records Office, the collection of Cecil's papers belonging to the Marquess of Salisbury at Hatfield, the Lansdowne Manuscript in the British Museum and the collection of the Marquess of Exeter at Burghley House. Hitherto unnoticed or undiscovered documentary material from these sources in combination with that drawn upon in the selective short studies of Burghley House noted above, and of the gardens by Till in his article 'The Development of the Park and Garden at Burghley' in Garden History (1991), form a core of information on which the thesis draws as a fundamental source.⁴⁷ Articles on Theobalds by Nichols and Summerson also constitute the starting point for comparison of the continual cross-referencing between the architecture of Burghley and of Cecil's other great house.⁴⁸ Much more extensive use than in previous studies has been made of visual material, the most important of which are illustrated at the beginning of Volume 3.⁴⁹

Subsequent changes affecting the architectural identity of William Cecil's Burghley House have been concentrated in three main periods. The first was in the latter part of the seventeenth century under the direction of the 5th Earl of Exeter (1648-1700), when the south front was extensively remodelled and the interior plan of the house in the south and west ranges was completely altered from its sixteenth-century form.⁵⁰ The research on the fabric of the house undertaken for the thesis has revealed the structural alterations during this period to have been even more radical than hitherto realized, and this again has allowed a more accurate reconstruction of the *plan as completed by Cecil* to be extrapolated.

The second period of change was in the second half of the eighteenth century under the 9th Earl (1725-93) when Capability Brown again remodelled the outlines of the south front, and the north-west service range was demolished.⁵¹ The third and final development was the creation of two-storey corridors on three sides of the courtyard, with

a major new frontispiece at the west end and ground-floor corridor at the east end. This was undertaken by John Gandy Deering between 1828-1833 for the 2nd Marquess of Exeter (1795-1867), to allow circulation round the ground and first floors of the house without intrusion into the principal rooms.⁵²

The nature of Burghley House as place does not lend itself to a straightforward chronologically linear approach; house, garden, park and courtyard inter-lock and criss-cross one another structurally, visually, socially and politically as inter-related parts of a complicated but integrated whole. The thesis has been structured therefore into three similarly interlocking basic parts; the body of the house, the garden and park, and the courtyard. Chapters Two and Three focus on the context of the building and the history of the first phase of Cecil's development of the house itself. Chapter Four concentrates on the development of the gardens and park that took place concurrently with the house, but it also focuses on the longer term results of their creation, and the nature of the relationship of part to part and part to whole within this triumvirate, and further, within the context of Cecil's wider interest in horticulture.

Chapter Five is devoted to the courtyard which is given specific attention as the epicentre of the architecture and function of the house. It is privileged space, which, unlike the external fronts, was accessible only to an invited audience and its sophisticated, French-inspired Renaissance architecture and imperial iconography reflect this status within the hierarchy of the house. While the analysis of the courtyard, garden and estate spans the whole period of Cecil's development of Burghley as place, Chapter Six in particular analyses the transformation of the overall body of the house effected by the second phase of Cecil's building from c. 1573 to 1588.

"Its purpose is its use". As this is the principal tenet around which the research and analysis of Burghley House has been structured, in the final chapter the dynamics of the architecture and plan are examined hypothetically as a working building as it was intended

to be employed during a progress visit. The conclusion arising from this analysis summarizes the implications of the thesis with regard to the specific history of Burghley House and within a wider cultural and temporal context.

Before embarking on Cecil's patronage and architecture at Burghley House, however, an overview of the wider field of his scholarship and architectural patronage in Chapter one provides a more extended introduction to the thesis. It may also serve to dispel some of the myths concerning the nature of sixteenth-century architectural patronage in England which have become part of the folk-lore of architectural history.

-
- 1 SP Ireland, 63/ 18/19, Letter to Sir Henry Sydney 26 August 1566
- 2 Cicero Eds Griffin & Aitkins 1991, 53
- 3 Starkey, 1982, 232
- 4 See for example Dovey 1992,45, 79-80, 115-7
- 5 L. B. Wright Ed. 1962, 10 (William Cecil's Advice to a Son... (c. 1585))
- 6 The Elizabethan court moved from palace to palace within the London area of course, but from the beginning of the reign Whitehall/ Westminster became the main centre (this is discussed more fully in Chapter 1)
- 7 SP Dom 12/181/32
- 8 Hussey 1953
- 9 Pevsner 1968, 217-225
- 10 Letters in the PRO State Papers Domestic concerning the building of Burghley House, which were transcribed by Gotch and first printed in RIBA Transactions Vol VI New Series LXVII 1890 are printed in the thesis as Appendix A. Also Gotch 1894, 1914 (1st pub. 1901), 1904, 1909 & 1936
- 11 Summerson 1949, 291-300
- 12 Pevsner 1968, 220
- 13 Hussey 1953, 1962
- 14 See Chapter 2
- 15 Girouard 1963, 36; and see Chapter 6
- 16 Girouard 1963, 36
- 17 Girouard 1992, 58
- 18 Girouard 1992, 58
- 19 Girouard 1992, 57 & 58
- 20 Howard 1987, 199
- 21 Mowl 1993, 86
- 22 See for example Summerson 1986, 75; Mowl 1993, 91 Burghley, on the other hand, is still dismissed; by Platt for example, describing the character of Cecil's later architecture as "a mindless copying of Italian grottesche, and the misapplied "flummery" of Flemish strap-work" (Platt 1994, 105)
- 23 Howard 'The architecture and Social History of the Tudor and Jacobean Great House: New Materials and New Methods' in Airs Ed. 1994, passim
- 24 Howard 'The architecture and Social History of the Tudor and Jacobean Great House: New Materials and New Methods' in Airs Ed. 1994, 7
- 25 Drury 1980, 1-39 & 1983 98-123; J.T. Smith 1992
- 26 I have kindly been given access to all parts of the house wherever possible, and also to parts of the fabric when these have been available for inspection, such as the hammerbeam roof when the great hall was scaffolded. Inevitably, however, certain areas of the house including parts of the cellars cannot be investigated
- 27 Girouard 1992, 58
- 28 See Chapter 1 & Chapter 5
- 29 Cited in J. Wilson 1986, 322
- 30 Read 1955, 11
- 31 Guillaume Ed. 1994, in particular K. de Jonge 'Le palais de Charles-Quint à Bruxelles : ses dispositions intérieures aux XV et XVI siècles et le cérémonial de Bourgogne' 107-127 and A. Tönnemann 'Le palais ducal d'Urbino : humanisme et réalité sociale'
- 32 See Chapter 1, and, for example, Read 1960, 76-77, 258 & 529; Nichols 1823, Vol 3, 75; BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 33, f70

-
- 33 See for example Waddy's work on Use and the Art of the Plan in Roman palaces of the seventeenth century (Waddy 1990) and her paper on 'The Roman Apartment from the Sixteenth to the Seventeenth Century' in Guillaume Ed. 1994
- 34 Cecil's meticulous planning for the queen's visit to Cambridge in 1564, for example, is detailed in Nichols 1823 Vol 1, 151-189, and likewise for Audley End in 1578 in Vol. 2, 110, and are mentioned below in Chapter 5. Listed details of items to be attended to for a dinner for the French embassy in 1586 at Cecil House are in BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 33 f70. Cecil's interest in the ceremonial forms of the Order of the Garter is discussed in Chapter 7
- 35 Cited in Nichols 1836, 150
- 36 Nichols 1823; Chambers 1923; Dunlop 1962; J. Wilson 1980 & 1986, 316-329; Dovey 1996
- 37 Thurley 1993, 1
- 38 Guillaume & Chastel Eds 1985; Coope 1986; Baillie 1967; Henderson (Unpublished PhD) 1992
- 39 Evett 1990, 70
- 40 Higgott 1992, 52 citing R. Wittkower 'Inigo Jones, Architect and Man of Letters' RIBA Journal LX (1953) 83-90
- 41 See Chapter 7
- 42 I am grateful to Alan Wilson, Honorary architect to Burghley House (now retired) for first bringing this refinement to my attention
- 43 Powers 1993, 34,
- 44 I use 'career' as a qualifying term to distinguish the architect in the modern sense of the word, while avoiding the term 'amateur architect' for Cecil as in this context 'patron' is a more accurate description of his position relative to the building
- 45 Girouard 1959, 201 and for further discussion on the discrepancies between interior and exterior of Longleat see Girouard 1983, 54
- 46 Horace Walpole's description of the house in the second half of the eighteenth century (Walpole Society 1927-28, 45)
- 47 Gotch 1894, 1914 (1st pub. 1901), 1904, 1909 & 1936; Hussey 1953; Pevsner 1968; Girouard 1963 & 1992; Till 1975 & 1991
- 48 Nichols 1836; Summerson 1959
- 49 See Vol. 3 the 'Explanation of Numbering System for Plans and Figures'
- 50 Hussey 1953, Pt. IV, 2104-7; Till 1975, 982-5
- 51 Till 1975, 982-5
- 52 Hussey 1953, Pt. I, 1828-1832

CHAPTER ONE : WILLIAM CECIL AS PATRON AND SCHOLAR

The issue of the calibre of patronage in England in the sixteenth century has been central to the interpretation of Elizabethan architecture in the twentieth. Elizabethan patrons of architecture have been mercilessly patronized and represented as "a philistine crew",¹ who were "happy to receive on trust a 'new fashion'" which they were able to believe "belonged somehow to the world of Julius Caesar and Augustus, of Seneca Virgil and Pliny".² They lived, it has been argued, at a time when "it had not yet occurred to the English mind to look for the original stem and root of the antique tree".³ Furthermore, the skill of the not-quite-architects whom they employed was limited to the ability to "copy quite pretty paper patterns containing only skin deep appreciation [of real classical design]".⁴ The results were "the lisping adventures of children attempting a new language".⁵ "No building was the creation of an able and reasoning mind, but rather the grafting of new details on old forms; extended and modified gradually to meet changing requirements, but seldom conceived as a whole."⁶ According to Gotch, who was somewhat more generous, the English, in terms of architecture, were "speaking in broken Italian" by the second half of the sixteenth century.⁷

These quotations have been isolated out of context, but they are not isolated examples. All of them stem from the same basic premise that the whole impetus of English architecture of the Elizabethan period was an awkward learning curve towards the realization of Italian Renaissance architectural form, perceived as being first understood 'properly' in England by Inigo Jones. Only then was this 'foreign' language comprehended. Modern scholarship in architectural history has broadened the discipline to encompass a more complex view of the historical circumstances within which architectural form and style developed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Nevertheless, the estimation of architectural patronage as simply backward and provincial within a European context has permeated the architectural history of the period to such an extent that this conditioning continues to influence the manner in which its architecture is

perceived. The very definition of "prodigy", the term now firmly fixed as an epithet to Elizabethan and Jacobean Great Houses such as Burghley, is of "something extraordinary... an amazing or marvellous thing; anything that causes wonder astonishment or surprise" but also of "something abnormal or monstrous".⁸ The implication is of a peculiarity, a phenomenon without logic that is most easily explained in terms of Samuel Daniel's lines:

Whilst timorous knowledge stands considering
Audacious ignorance hath done the deed".⁹

The apparent inability of patrons and 'architects' to grasp classical architecture as an intellectual discipline, of treating it simply as a 'visual' art, has meant that the cultural isolation presumed to have followed the break with Rome has been interpreted as particularly limiting. The medium of architecture for those of such arrested intellectual development is regarded as confined to the built form or its picture, referred to by Vitruvius (as translated by John Dee in 1570) as "the thing signified". While "that which signifieth",¹⁰ the theory and demonstration of the principles, available through the transportable written word and diagrammatic illustration, was beyond the understanding of the "philistine crew".¹¹

These interpretations give a particularly distorted impression with regard to William Cecil's architectural experience, his intellectual stature, and the context of his wider cultural and political background. No study of his architectural patronage has been undertaken since the focus of architectural history has widened beyond and away from a purely stylistic approach. The claim is not that the physical separation from the built environment of Europe and its leading exponents had no effect upon the patronage of English architecture, but that the isolation was less absolute than is frequently supposed, and the effect deserves to be examined from an altered perspective.

Underlying the argument for the weakness of English patronage has been the ingrained belief that 'taste' - so closely identified by classicists with the aesthetics of classical architecture - and old money are joined at the hip. Only time can wear the vulgar shine off the nouveaux riches and make possible such a graft.

It was, however, precisely the "new" men and women of the mid-sixteenth century whose power base was being founded not on military prowess or an established position in the aristocracy, but on their intellectual abilities. It was they who were most receptive to searching for "the original stem and root of the antique tree" in the academic sense.¹² In fact, William Cecil is one of few figures from any age for whom, with the possible exception of music, one might claim all of the abilities recommended by Vitruvius for the ideal architect to possess:-

"An architect (sayth he) ought to understand Languages, to be skillful of Painting, well instructed in Geometrie, not ignorant of Perspective, furnished with Arithmetike, have knowledge of many histories and, diligently haue heard Philosophers, haue skill of Musike, not ignorant of Physike, know the aunsweres of Lawyers, and haue Astronomie, and the courses Coelestiall, in good knowledge.' He geueth reason, orderly wherefore all these Artes Doctrinces and instructions are requisite in an excellent Architect".¹³

It was these extravagant pretensions of accomplishments deemed necessary for the architect that Jonson was to satirize in the first quarter of the seventeenth century with the characters of Dominus Do All¹⁴ and Coronell Iniquo Vitruvius.¹⁵ The premise quoted above is as translated by John Dee in the preface to Humphrey Billingsley's translation of Euclid's Elements, published in London in 1570. Dee also was quoting Vitruvius in support of the argument for a change of attitude in the interpretation of the nature of architecture itself, which Jonson was still hotly contesting in the seventeenth century. Architecture, Dee admits, "to many may seme not worthy, or not mete, to be reckned

among the Artes Mathematicall ... because it is for building, of a house, Pallace, Church, Forte, or such like, grosse workes" . But, he contends, the architect physically deals with "no Materiall or corruptible thing", he only causes the "mechaniciens worke" through his exclusive use of abstract and conceptual means derived "from the Principals".¹⁶ The architect, as defined by Vitruvius, is not only differentiated from the mechanicals in this way, but also from the layman, who cannot judge a building until the finished product is realized. The architect, on the other hand, "as soon as he has formed the conception, and before he begins the work, has a definite idea of the beauty, the convenience and the propriety that will distinguish it".¹⁷

Cecil similarly possessed this defining attribute of the architect. If the "conceptions" might not be entirely his own, he was certainly capable of understanding and judging buildings in purely conceptual intellectual and graphic form. He was, of course, not a career architect, but neither can he be labelled as what was later termed a dilettante. He was a career politician but his involvement with the Office of the Royal Works went well beyond a merely administrative engagement with the programme of state architecture. The concept of his houses meanwhile addressed all three of the aspects that "distinguish" true architecture in Vitruvian terms. Not just the idea of " beauty", but equally those of "the convenience and the propriety".¹⁸

Cecil's pervasive influence over corporate cultural patronage in England was principally directed towards harnessing scholarship and the arts to the needs of the state, as fundamental ways of managing a competitive 'modern' European nation. Equally important was their role in creating and promoting a clear and appropriate identity to embody the image of such a nation. The queen's pet name for Cecil was her "Spirit"¹⁹ and, Ariel-like, his influence during her reign appears to have been everywhere at once. His personal ambition was so reliant upon the success of England and of Elizabeth's monarchy that his private and public interests can rarely be entirely separated. His patronage, without doubt, reflected his personal scholarly preoccupations and the broadly-

based intellectual curiosity of a model humanist uomo universale . It was vested in the belief that intellectual pursuits were the practical essence of the active life, not the exclusive province of the contemplative one. His intellectual and artistic patronage can rarely be seen purely as that of a Maecenas fostering scholarship and art for art's sake in an atmosphere of cultivated leisure, but it can be identified in a more significant, if less romantic, role, playing a key part in his political and economic policies.

Cecil's ambitious and broad-ranging approach to the intellectual activity of others is reflected in his own educational background and the highly political social ambience to which it introduced him. "Studies serve for delight, for ornament and for ability"²⁰ as Francis Bacon, Cecil's nephew, was to observe. While Cecil was not blind to the first two objectives, it is the third with which he was most concerned;

"for ability, is in the judgement and disposition of
business. For expert men can execute, and perhaps
judge of particulars, one by one; but the general counsels,
and the plots and marshalling of affairs, come best
from those that are learned." ²¹

If the architect needed to be exceptionally well educated, so too did the statesman.

Cecil's learning began with a grammar school education in Lincolnshire, from where he went up to St John's, Cambridge in 1535 at the young but, for the period, not exceptional age of fifteen. He stayed for six years and became associated with the progressive group known as the "Athenians"²² who believed in the teaching of Greek as an essential tool of biblical as well as classical scholarship. Cambridge was a centre of radical Protestantism and its "new learning", as this was defined at the time. Amongst the Athenians were those prepared to follow the lead given by Erasmus to undertake ad fontes research of primary source material,²³ the "original root and stem of the antique tree",²⁴

which might challenge the received orthodoxies of second-hand translations and interpretations that had become the bedrock of traditional scholasticism. St John's was a leading centre of this movement within the university which in turn regarded itself as one of the principal intellectual centres of Europe. Erasmus, who lectured on Greek and Divinity at the university from 1511 to 1514, wrote of it in these terms:

"it has become so flourishing that it may vie with the first schools of the age and possesses men compared with whome those old teachers appear mere shadows of theologians" ²⁵

Of those who tutored Cecil and became his close friends, John Cheke and Thomas Smith, in particular, were ardent followers of Erasmus.²⁶ Cecil himself subsequently became Chancellor of the university in February 1559 and throughout his career favoured men educated at Cambridge for employment in state administration. The strength of the "Cambridge Connection" in both the Edwardian and Elizabethan administrations has been well established.²⁷ Cambridge men who were key figures in both regimes and who were members of Cecil's circle included Sir Thomas Smith, Sir Walter Mildmay, Sir Thomas Gresham, Sir Thomas Hoby and Sir Nicholas Bacon, all of whom were to be responsible for major buildings in this period.

Three months after leaving Cambridge, Cecil married Mary Cheke and nine months later she gave birth to their son, Thomas Cecil. Mary's brother was Cecil's friend and tutor, John Cheke. Cheke was a scholar of international renown who became tutor to Edward VI and was subsequently knighted. But although of equal if not better pedigree than the Cecils, the Cheke family was neither wealthy nor well-connected, and William's father appears to have disapproved of a match described by Barnett as "probably the only personal strategic mistake Cecil ever made".²⁸

From Cambridge he went to Gray's Inn in 1541 or 1542. As well as providing a legal training, Gray's was on a par with Cambridge as a fashionable networking centre for the court. Roger Ascham, who taught Cecil at Cambridge, wrote in the typical panegyric terms of the time how even as a young man Cecil was "possessed of such prudence beyond his years, such learning and such moderation that the voice of all ascribes to him the possession of all those four excellencies which Thucydides says were blended in the Athenian Pericles."²⁹ The natural progression for someone of Cecil's already acknowledged ability and ambition was to the centre of power in Lord Protector Somerset's household to which he was duly appointed in 1547. In the winter of 1547-48 he was given the office of Master of Requests, an influential post as the formal conduit through which Somerset's patronage had to be sought.³⁰

Mary Cecil died in 1543 and in December 1545 Cecil made a more advantageous match to Mildred Cooke, this time with the full approval of his parents.³¹ She was the eldest daughter of Sir Anthony Cooke of Gidea Hall in Hertfordshire, the family seat which Cooke began improving in the mid-1560s at the same time as Cecil began building nearby at Theobalds. Cooke was himself a distinguished gentleman academic and polymath, a committed Protestant whose interests were scientific as well as literary and who was tutor to both Edward VI and the Princess Elizabeth. Mildred, like her four sisters, was a notable scholar and translator, and shared her father's strong Protestant beliefs. Ascham was as complimentary about her intellectual abilities as her husband's, referring to her and Lady Jane Grey as the two most learned women in England.³² Surviving correspondence with leading political figures indicates her grasp of political affairs, and her active participation concerning Scottish affairs in the 1560s, for instance, is evident from letters written to her from Maitland and Arran.³³

In the mid-1550s the second Cooke sister, Anne, married Nicholas Bacon. Anne was as able as her sister and had a number of her translations of ancient texts published during her lifetime,³⁴ while Bacon was a progressive educationalist and was already

established as a leading lawyer. Under Elizabeth he became Lord Keeper of the Seal and a member of the Privy Council. He built several interesting houses in East Anglia for which, like Cecil at Burghley, he controlled operations from long-distance.³⁵ He had family connections with another member of Cecil's 'circle', Thomas Gresham, who, besides being responsible for the Royal Exchange and Gresham House (later Gresham College) in London, developed Intwood Hall in the same neighbourhood as Bacon's Redgrave Hall in Suffolk. Bacon was involved in overseeing the rebuilding of the Hall of Gray's Inn in the 1550s, and headed the committee responsible for the rebuilding of St. Paul's Cathedral after lightning struck in 1561.³⁶ He bought the manor of Gorhambury in the "courtier belt" near St Albans in the same year and, like Cecil and Cooke, began his own house-building there in the mid-1560s. In 1572 it was to Cecil that he wrote for advice as to how he might best prepare the house to accommodate an anticipated visit from the queen.³⁷

The third Cooke sister, Elizabeth, lived in the Cecils' household until she married Thomas Hoby in 1558.³⁸ Hoby's translation of Castiglione's Courtier was published in 1561. First published in 1528, the book was hugely successful and influential throughout Europe where it remained the bible of ideal courtly behaviour even though its specific political context was largely an anachronism by the time of its first publication.³⁹ Hoby had been at St John's and subsequently studied theology and classics under Marcel Bucer in Strasbourg.⁴⁰ He made a number of tours of Europe in the 1540s and 1550s when he visited most of the major sites of contemporary and ancient architecture in France, Germany, Italy and the Netherlands, guided by descriptions taken from classical literature as well as modern archaeological publications. He spent over 6 months in Rome, for instance, only leaving "after Mr. Barker, Mr. Parker, Whithorn and I had thowghlie searched owt suche antiquities as were here to bee seene from place to place having bestowed all this time of our being here abowt the same"⁴¹ His diary gives a vivid account of his impressions and almost certainly would have been accessible to Cecil. Following Hoby's marriage to Elizabeth Cooke, they spent the summer of 1558 with the Cecils at Burghley.⁴² The diary was obviously intended to be read by others and it contained a

wealth of valuable data, on administration and fortifications, for instance, that would have been of considerable political interest to Cecil.⁴³

In 1563 Katherine, the fourth Cooke sister married the diplomat, Henry Killigrew, also educated at Cambridge. Sir John Harrington kept some Latin verses by her which refer to Cecil, together with his notes for his translation of Ariosto's Orlando Furioso, which were published after her death.⁴⁴ Cecil initially disapproved of the match,⁴⁵ but although he was not always on good terms with either Killigrew or Bacon, his rapidly growing structure of powerful social and intellectual connections was considerably reinforced through his marriage to Mildred. The scholarly and ambitious members of the extended family became the core of the circle which made up his close personal friendships, which doubled as an important part of his political and diplomatic network. Like Cecil, almost all of them were to affirm and consolidate their personal success by building or redeveloping houses on the grand scale and most of them were duly 'rewarded' by a visit from the queen.

A number of these Protestant colleagues and friends became "Marian exiles" travelling widely, studying and teaching in the intellectual centres of the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland, France and Italy during her reign. Cecil's evolving web of wider contacts with leading Protestant academics, many of whom also played significant roles in the political life of their own countries, was furthered through these exiles who were intellectually at ease in the European sphere.⁴⁶ Cheke, who was later himself to recant,⁴⁷ expressed doubts about Cecil's loyalty to the Protestant faith back in England. Nevertheless, he was prepared to search for Greek books from his own collection requested by Cecil,⁴⁸ and most of the group kept in close touch with one another and in regular correspondence with Cecil who was handling the property and family affairs of a number of them in their absence.⁴⁹

The diplomat and soldier Philip Hoby, Thomas's elder half-brother by twenty years, was also a close family friend of the Cecils. He had already been on important ambassadorial missions to Spain and Portugal during Henry VIII's reign. Appointed to the Privy Council in Edward's reign, in 1548 he was ambassador at the court of Charles V. He and Thomas began remodelling Bisham Abbey, originally a Knights Templar's Hall, in the mid-1550s, at the same time as Cecil started work on Burghley House. As was also the case with Bacon, they and Cecil kept in touch with one another's building activities.⁵⁰ Philip was acquainted with Titian and Aretino and was familiar with the ruling patricians of the Venetian republic,⁵¹ amongst whom were Palladio's patrons. Daniele Barbaro, who following his father's death in April 1549, commissioned Palladio to draw up designs for the Villa Barbaro was himself Venetian ambassador at the court of Edward VI from June 1549-1551.⁵² He was in contact with the intellectual circles, actively promoting the work of Aretino.⁵³ His edition and seminal commentary on Vitruvius, illustrated by Palladio, was subsequently published in 1556.⁵⁴ There is no record of any direct contact between Cecil and Barbaro, but given the keen interest in architecture of the leading figures of the Somerset circle and the intimate circumstances of court life, some exchange on the subject with members of the group is a strong possibility.⁵⁵ Barbaro made no comment upon the domestic architecture of England in his report to the Council on his return to Venice, but he had obviously taken an interest in the important military architecture of Berwick-on-Tweed, which Somerset had begun modernising after the Battle of Pinkie in 1547. The report described it as "fortified in the modern fashion [i.e. the Italian fashion] and the work still in progress" and he provided a drawing to illustrate its salient features.⁵⁶

Cecil himself is only known to have made two brief visits abroad to northern Europe, both during Mary's reign. On the second he undertook a tour of all the major centres in the Netherlands where he would have seen the latest architecture of some of the wealthiest cities on the Continent. He visited the university town of Louvain which, like Cambridge, was one of Europe's principal intellectual centres at the time.⁵⁷ Language

was not a problem as, like his wife, Cecil had good command of Latin and Greek and, though he disclaimed it, spoke, wrote and read in all the major modern European languages.⁵⁸ Although Cecil was himself restricted from travelling abroad during Elizabeth's reign, he sent both of his sons on extended tours of Europe to complete their education.

By the time Elizabeth came to the throne Cecil already had a range of informal contacts who regularly reported to him from all over the Continent - "wryte to me of the commen talk of that countree" ⁵⁹ he instructed Thomas Wyndebank who was travelling with his son, Thomas Cecil, and about to go to Flanders in 1562. Thomas Gresham and his agent Richard Clough were in regular correspondence with him from Antwerp, from where Clough wrote lengthy descriptions of the pageantry of major ceremonial events, such as the funeral of Charles V, with the "minuteness of a Dutch painter".⁶⁰ Richard Moryson sent him lively accounts, in one of them comparing Cecil's immaculate logic as applied to complex European affairs to the perfection of a geometric figure.⁶¹ To these personal contacts were now added the official ambassadors, many of whom, like Nicholas Throckmorton and Thomas Smith, (who followed Throckmorton to Paris in 1562), were already Cecil's close associates. In the month of March 1561 alone, Cecil received over twenty-five letters on foreign affairs from places including Frankfort, Paris, Strasbourg, Madrid, Mansfelt, Zurich, Antwerp and Venice, besides the official reports and intelligences not personally addressed to him.⁶² John Shers, his listening-post in Venice, opens one of his letters "this week brings nothing ..." ⁶³ indicating the regularity of the correspondence, and these sorts of levels of frequency were maintained throughout Cecil's lifetime. Despite being grounded in England, Cecil must have been as well-informed and up-to-date about Continental affairs as anyone on the mainland. He was to be loathed by a number of the ambassadors from rival powers who had to deal with him at Elizabeth's court, but even the most hostile respected his political acumen, intellectual grasp and ability in handling European affairs. As the Spanish ambassador, Guerau de Spes, grudgingly

acknowledged in his report to Philip II, following his dismissal from the English court over the Ridolfi plot in 1571,

"He is a man of mean sort but very astute, false lying and full of artifice. He is a great heretic and such a Clownish Englishman as to believe that all the Christian princes joined together are not able to injure the sovereign of his country...This man manages the bulk of the business and by means of his vigilance and craftiness, together with his utter unscrupulousness of word and deed, thinks to outwit the ministers of other princes. This, to a certain extent, he hath hitherto succeeded in doing" ⁶⁴.

Cecil's outlook was utterly Anglo-centric but it was not provincial in the sense of being naive or ignorant of the wider world. He and his circle were part of a cosmopolitan intelligentsia who were indeed "very different from, for instance, the Whig aristocracy of the eighteenth century" ⁶⁵ with whom sixteenth-century patrons have so frequently been unfavourably compared, in that they were integrated into the mainstream of European intellectual circles, and on the whole, had more intellectual weight.

The breadth of scientific, scholarly and artistic activities in which Cecil was engaged can be compared with those of contemporary patrons of the Veneto such as Giangiorgio Trissino, Alvise Cornaro and Daniele Barbaro.⁶⁶ Besides military and secular architecture, Cecil was involved in civil engineering, in land reclamation, and Fen drainage.⁶⁷ He was concerned for instance in a scheme to improve the drainage and water supply system for the town of Cambridge following an outbreak of the plague, ⁶⁸ and Camden credited him also with the revitalisation of the Thames, "to whom this river owns itself obliged for the recovery of its ancient channell".⁶⁹ His horticultural interests included the creation of three great gardens at Burghley, Theobalds and Cecil House. A keen collector of plants himself, he was also patron to the herbalist, John Gerard, who compiled and published the first complete catalogue of a garden, which he dedicated to Cecil, and

was in charge of Cecil's gardens from the mid-1570s, as well as the physic garden belonging to the Barber-Surgeons Company.⁷⁰

Cecil's chronic gout gave him a personal interest in medicine. In 1575 he had promised books on medicine and the law to the library at Cambridge⁷¹ although neither subject was on the curriculum, and works on medical topics and the developing science of anatomy were dedicated to him.⁷² John Dee, who was yet another St. John's scholar, writing to Cecil as his patron in 1574, refers to the support Cecil had given him in the course of his mathematical and philosophical pursuits, and how "so much of my interest and studious doings is well known to you".⁷³ Dee was after a pension and obviously out to flatter Cecil, but Cecil's interest in surveying, cartography, perspective and architecture testify to his genuine applied knowledge of mathematical subjects. In 1573 Thomas Digges, a close associate of Dee, dedicated his book on the mathematics of the universe based on Copernican principles of astronomy to Cecil. At Theobalds Cecil commissioned him to build an astronomical model for the gardens.⁷⁴ In the house at Theobalds, as Rathgeb detailed in 1592

"The ceiling or upper floor is very artistically constructed; it contains the twelve signs of the zodiac, so that at night you can see distinctly the stars proper to each ; on the same stage the sun performs its course, which is without doubt contrived by some ingenious mechanism"⁷⁵

The description suggests that this ingenious and attractive pre-Copernican device, combining astronomy and astrology, was somehow open to the sky at night. Baron Waldstein, visiting in 1600, referred to an "Astronomer's Walk"⁷⁶ on the rooftops which may have been related to this.

The Cecils' scholarly London household in the Strand became an established centre of intellectual as well as political life. Among the frequent European guests were poet-

diplomats such as Charles Utenhove from Ghent, who first visited in 1562 and probably became Mildred's Greek tutor. He later acted as a foreign agent for Cecil, writing to him en route to the court of Cleves in 1565 that he would furnish Cecil with "a whole Iliad of German News."⁷⁷ The English-based Italian writer, Pietro Bizari acted in a similar capacity when in Italy.⁷⁸ Hadrianus Junius, whose intellectual brilliance developed well beyond that of the English contemporaries he had been familiar with while in the Howard household in the 1540s, wrote poems for Cecil and Mildred during his last London visit, probably in 1568.⁷⁹ The Dutch politician, van der Does, who was also known as "one of the most prominent poets of his country",⁸⁰ came in 1584-5 to negotiate for English intervention in the Netherlands. He was particularly recommended to Cecil on the merit of his Latin poetry and gave him a volume of his poems with a hand-written dedication implying that Cecil was his patron.⁸¹ As Philip Sidney argued, poets and eloquent poetry could be considered to have a serious political role in the persuasive armoury of the civilized world of the courtier-diplomat.⁸² Cecil obviously enjoyed and valued the company of such men, as well as taking political advantage from the hospitality he offered to them.

While the Parisian literati were encouraged, particularly during Thomas Smith's ambassadorship, to meet in the English embassy in Paris, just as they did at the French embassy in London, the Cecils' personal "salon" seems to have been unique in England during the first part of Elizabeth's reign.⁸³ Mildred's potential value as "diplomatic wife" in this sort of context was pointed out to Walsingham in 1577. Reporting on a highly successful meeting between the Emperor Maximilian and the Danish monarch which the presence of their wives had obviously helped to promote, Johan Sturm (himself one of the leading educationalists in Europe as well as an influential and political figure) expressed his wish that the Lord Treasurer, Cecil, whose wife could converse in Latin, would visit Europe. It was, Sturm concluded, by the intimacy of such personal contact that "if they [European royalty] begin to trust you they are constant friends."⁸⁴

Cecil House provided the ideal cultivated politico-intellectual ambience for the gilded youth brought up in William and Mildred's household. As Master of the Wards, control of the income of some of the wealthiest and best-connected minors in the land provided Cecil with a substantial fillip to his own income and gave him an important stake in the patronage system.⁸⁵ Those who became members of his household, as well as his own male and female children, were subject to a rigorous educational programme devised by Cecil and undertaken by a number of leading scholars who were retained there.⁸⁶ On state occasions held at Cecil House the young men were expected to wait at table and display their language skills.⁸⁷ "Your purpose is, being a gentleman born, to furnish yourself with the knowledge of such things as may be serviceable to your country and fit for your calling",⁸⁸ Philip Sidney, who himself spent time as a favourite in the Cecil household, later counselled his brother. Cecil wrote to his ward, the Earl of Rutland in a similar vein, urging him to study because "of a desire that I have to proove you to be an ornament hereafter to your country, when I be in my grave".⁸⁹ Ornamental in Cecil's terms meant intellectually useful. A place in his household was regarded as the best training school for the young gentry in England.⁹⁰ Intellectually and socially, those who were exposed to it were equipped as well as they might have been anywhere in Europe.

A number of Cecil's former wards were to become his adversaries. But while his influence over their political persuasions may have been rejected, men like Lords Oxford, Zouche, Rutland, Southampton and Essex, as well as Philip Sidney and Robert Cecil, all of whom had been exposed to the cultured environment of his household, were to become key figures in the enlightened literary, musical and artistic patronage of their own more glittering generation.⁹¹

The germ of the idea for Roger Ascham's The Schoolmaster which was, according to the dedication "...specially purposed for the private brying up of youth in gentlemen and noble mens houses.." followed from discussion at a dinner hosted by Cecil at Windsor in 1563, where, Ascham claimed, he was in the company of "many wise and good men

together, as hardly could have been piked out againe, out of all England beside." ⁹² The book was published posthumously and dedicated to Cecil by Ascham's impoverished widow. It was one of over ninety books dedicated to Cecil throughout Elizabeth's reign.⁹³ The political, and potential commercial advantage of such an association obviously played as great a part in the choice as any direct patronage received by the dedicator may have done. In a number of cases however, as with Ascham, Cecil's direct personal involvement can be established. The dedications cover publications on an extremely wide range of subjects, from editions and translations of classical literature, military engineering, medicine, horticulture, mathematics, history, cosmography, and surveying, to oratory and foreign language dictionaries. Cecil took a serious interest in each of these fields and it is unlikely he would have allowed his name to be associated with an author without due cause. Even if it was a form of free patronage from Cecil's point of view, it was still of considerable value to the client.

Cecil also amassed a great library. His political position required him to keep up-to-date with contemporary literary works. During Edward's reign he was appointed with William Petre and Thomas Smith to scrutinize all books published in England before they could come onto the market. ⁹⁴ In Elizabeth's reign he and Archbishop Parker kept a strict, though by no means always successful eye on the European publishing scene, in an attempt to control the spread of books and pamphlets which were published abroad in an attempt to avoid such censorship.⁹⁵ A regular supply of books that were either requested by Cecil or considered to be to his taste was also sent to him from contacts in Europe. In 1559, for instance, Sir Thomas Chaloner was searching out inexpensive but "things rare and delectable : maps books and other like trinkets" for him.⁹⁶ Chaloner was another close friend and St. John's man who "englished" Erasmus' In Praise of Folly and had a reputation as a poet as well as a diplomat.⁹⁷ Similarly, in 1561 Cecil wrote to Wyndebank in Paris asking for the works of Cicero "in small volumes",⁹⁸ lending credence, perhaps, to Peacham's description of Cecil carrying a copy of "Tully's De Officiis " about with him at all times.⁹⁹ He also wanted Wyndebank to send a Latin bible and one in French

which "I would have lye in my chappell" and "any particular charte of contries or provinces whereof you think I have need" .¹⁰⁰

Between January 1554 and December 1555 Cecil had purchased seventy books through William Seres, the London printer and bookseller,¹⁰¹ whose substantial business owed much to Cecil's patronage and influence.¹⁰² These books consisted mostly of classical or biblical texts, and Read may be correct in concluding that Cecil "took no interest in the unfolding glories of English literature".¹⁰³ Certainly his tastes appear on the whole to be firmly rooted in classical literature. It has to be remembered, however, that new works, such as Sir Philip Sidney's Arcadia were customarily circulated in manuscript form and were not formally published until a much later date, and would therefore not appear in documents such as Seres' account.¹⁰⁴ It is reasonable to assume, at least, that Cecil would have been aware of current literary output which so frequently had a political dimension. He is rightfully accused of an unwillingness to promote either Sidney, his former protégé, or Edmund Spenser's public careers and of being reluctant to pay Spenser a pension. However, they were both affiliated to a rival political grouping, and Cecil's as well as the crown's advancements and rewards were characteristically more directly connected with creative activity associated with political service than with an appreciation of artistic merit alone.¹⁰⁵

Cecil's library was praised by Parker, "in the riches whereof I rejoyce as much as they were my own."¹⁰⁶ The inventory of books in the Hatfield library made in 1614 lists 1231 titles .¹⁰⁷ Cecil left part of his library to his younger son, Robert, for whom this inventory was made, and no doubt Robert had added substantially to the collection by 1614.¹⁰⁸ However, it contains a collection of architectural books including a number of volumes of Euclid's Elements, two copies of Vitruvius, Dürer's de Architectura (sic) and Hans Blum's Quinque Columnarum,¹⁰⁹ all of which were in print in William Cecil's lifetime and, in all probability, originally belonged to him. He was familiar with Thomas Smith's collection of architectural books, as is evident from his well-known request to

Henry Norris in Paris in 1568, asking for a particular volume on architecture seen at Smith's "or if you think there is any better of a later making of that argument".¹¹⁰ He obviously expected to keep right up-to-date with the latest European architectural publications. Moreover, given his intense interest in the subject, the singling out of one particular title suggests that he already had copies of other works in Smith's collection. Sir William Pickering, yet another Cambridge friend who regularly supplied books to Cecil, wrote in December 1551 hoping Cecil had received the books he had sent from Antwerp. "As for the Euclid and Machiavelli, they are so buggerly bound" Pickering informed him, he had burnt them both.¹¹¹ It is clear from an earlier letter that Cecil had requested the books and that the Euclid was "with figures". Cecil was undoubtedly already on the lookout for the latest works for Pickering added that he was unaware of anything new but "one out of Italy which is not got abroad"¹¹² but which would be sent as soon as he had a copy. By 1561 Cecil had a copy of the 1560 edition of Jean Cousin's Livres de Perspective, given to him by Sir Nicholas Throckmorton.¹¹³ Cousin's academic treatise, which includes details of the proportional system of classical architecture, also recommends "Marc Vitruve, Sebastian Serlio, Leon Baptiste Tuscan" as further reading.¹¹⁴ Cecil continued to add to his collection and to keep it up-to-date for he later sent to Paris for the expanded 1576 edition of Philibert de l'Orme's "Novels institution per bien bâster et à petits frais" [sic].¹¹⁵

The provenance of the printed books in the catalogue of 1687 for the sale of what was claimed to comprise "the main part of the library of that Famous Secretary William Cecil, Lord Burleigh"¹¹⁶ is less assured than the Hatfield inventory of 1614. The sale did, however, include a copy of William Bourne's Book of Geometry and Perspective with his treatise of the use of Artillery dedicated to Cecil, a copy of which Bourne had sent Cecil in 1572.¹¹⁷ There was also what is listed as Dürer's de Urbibus & Archibus condendis ac Muniendis published in Paris in 1539; again two editions of Euclid's Elements, one with commentary, both published in Basle in the 1530s and 1540s; an edition of Alberti's Architettura in Italian of 1546; and Du Cerceau's Opus de Architectura

cum Figuris, published in Paris in 1559. Philander's Annotationes in Architecturam Vitruvii published in Paris in 1545 was listed amongst the numerous "Libri Mathematici" in the catalogue.¹¹⁸ Thomas Smith also had a copy of Philander's commentaries amongst the various editions of Vitruvius in his library. As Simpson points out, works such as this which discuss the text in comparison with other ancient texts, demonstrate the intellectual approach favoured by humanist scholars. The comparative critical methods applied, in this case, to the subject of architecture and design,¹¹⁹ one can imagine would have appealed to the academic tastes of both Smith and Cecil.

John Dee, like Smith, owned several copies of Vitruvius including Philander's, and also one of the 1567 printing of Daniele Barbaro's edition with its lengthy commentaries and illustrations by Palladio. Alberti's Architectura in Latin and French and Francesco di Giorgio's Harmonia mundi were amongst his other books on architecture and perspective.¹²⁰ A copy from Burghley House of Billingsley's Euclid in which Dee quoted so extensively from Vitruvius and Alberti was sold at Christies together with other sixteenth-century books, in July 1959.¹²¹

Dee shared Cecil's passion for genealogy and his admiration for De Officiis,¹²² and certainly Cecil employed him elsewhere as a geographer, and gave serious consideration to his proposals for the reform of the calendar.¹²³ By 1583 Dee's library contained over 4,000 volumes. He had the best collection of scientific manuscripts in the country which he made available to scholars and antiquarians. As a fellow collector of manuscripts Cecil, whose house at Wimbledon was in the next parish, would undoubtedly have had access to Dee's library in his house at Mortlake.¹²⁴

The 1687 catalogue of what was advertized as Cecil's library also lists numerous works on genealogy, history, classical philosophy, theological and political commentary, military architecture and engineering, navigation, cosmography astronomy and alchemy published in his lifetime.¹²⁵ These were all subjects in which Cecil is known to have

taken a particular interest. There were also a number of works by leading humanist writers of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries including Bembo, Aeneas Sylvius, Paolo Emilio and of Aretino, whose works Barbaro had been pushing when in England.¹²⁶

While Cecil's immediate political focus was on current affairs in Europe, his principal academic interest in European culture appears to have been concentrated on the widespread "cult of the antique" and he became an antiquarian and collector of some renown. In 1552 Ascham was sending him a medallion of Augustus and a coin featuring Nero, and other friends and contacts regularly supplied similar items.¹²⁷ By 1577 William Camden, also a dedicated antiquarian who had recently been in Munich and Augsburg where he had examined Marcus Fugger's outstanding coin collection, was writing to the great European scholar and cartographer, Ortelius,¹²⁸ telling him how

"if you had not left London so unexpectedly, you would have seen the antiquities of Lord Burghley, High Treasurer of England, who possesses many coins and very rare ancient monuments, and is after your Laurini, the most indefatigable explorer of early times, and who, seeing from your Deorum Capita (which Dean Goodman gave him) that you take a delight in coins, wished that you had seen his collection".¹²⁹

In August 1561 John Shers, on returning from Venice, wrote to Cecil informing him that he had "brought for you the statues of twelve of the emperors", similar to a set Cecil had seen while in Antwerp, and that he would be happy to procure further works from Italy for him.¹³⁰ Busts of the Roman emperors were later to be a much remarked upon feature of the gardens at Theobalds,¹³¹ although as this property was not even in Cecil's possession in 1561, these statues must have been destined either for Burghley, or for Cecil House where, as Camden relates, an inscription taken from the Roman remains at Silchester in Hampshire was set up in the gardens of "that Nestor of Britain."¹³²

Cecil was also importing ready-made modern architectural features in the classical style from Flanders and France during the 1560s and 1570s including a gallery, marble pillars, door surrounds and tables, and a decorative stone floor.¹³³ A letter from Nicholas Houel written in October 1571 demonstrates the sort of unsolicited access to the European art market, the 'cold sell', that Cecil's position exposed him to:

"Hearing of the Queen's perfections, her favour for science and her love of painting and portraiture and that she means to make a large collection of portraits and knowing that your merit has made you first in the council, I beg you to inform her that for twenty-five years I have been collecting the portraits of the most excellent workmen in the world / Italian, French and German. I have enough to make 20 volumes, which could enrich her library... Greek and Roman history, drolleries, nobles with their forms, architecture, Albert Dürer's work etc. Also I have a cabinet of pictures of the best masters, also busts, medals, vases..."¹³⁴

The letter is of particular interest because it establishes contact between Cecil and Houel who was propagandist and artistic adviser to Catherine de Medici. In 1571 Houel most probably acted as art director to the poet Ronsard's copywriter, in the iconographic programme devised for the entry of Charles IX and his bride, Elizabeth of Austria, into Paris. The theme was that of Ronsard's Franciade and celebrated the conjoining of two monarchies both of which claimed to be descended from Trojan ancestors, popularly believed in the sixteenth century to be the founders of Rome. The iconography drew upon the illustrations from Houel's Histoire des Anciens Rois de France, the text of which is now lost.¹³⁵ Like the French, the Tudor dynasty claimed similarly mythical genealogical connections stemming back to the Trojans.¹³⁶ Cecil himself introduced important Trojan iconography as part of an imperial theme in the courtyard at Burghley.¹³⁷ As Yates observed, "All the monarchs of Europe sought Trojan ancestors through whom to link their destinies and origins with Imperial Rome".¹³⁸ Equal rights to the heritage of ancient

classical civilisation were being asserted in Tudor England to those being advanced in the other nations of western Europe, whose monarchies' more recent dynastic claims to the throne were in reality often as uncertain as those of the Tudors.

These fictitious, though at the time widely accepted associations, were motivated by more than grandiloquent posturing. Following the Papal Bull excommunicating Queen Elizabeth in 1570, Cecil himself drafted a pamphlet that claimed to trace British history back to Brutus of Troy in order to support the "legal" argument formulated in Henry VIII's reign, that the sovereign's imperial authority pre-dated that of the papacy.¹³⁹ This tract was never published, but such typologies continued to provide extremely useful propaganda themes with which to boost the image and authority of a fundamentally fragile regime. Where it was politically expedient, Cecil was prepared to argue what had already been exposed early in the sixteenth century, and indeed questioned from its very inception as the dubious case for this so called "British History",¹⁴⁰ in order to forge a historical identity in both senses of the word. His pragmatic approach in politics can be seen as that of the trained advocate and orator. In this he followed the example of his mentor, Cicero, in *De Officiis* who has been described as using "his licence as a sceptical Academic to adopt the arguments that he found, at that time and on that subject, the most convincing".¹⁴¹ Although Cecil can also be credited with the promotion and patronage of genuine historical research, where necessary, like his European peers, he was quite willing to bend factual history into a manufactured one. Clearly he understood the competitive value of locating a specific national identity within this prestigious international cultural heritage. It formed an important constituent of the political glue that was intended to bond the country together and to the queen.

Developing the language, history, geography and carefully controlled image of England and its monarch as aspects of a homogeneous and high-profile entity were core constituents of Cecil's patronage. His manuscript collection, as with his printed library, was admired by his friend and rival collector, Archbishop Parker, whose own collection

was second to none in the country.¹⁴² Parker's interest also extended beyond the ivory tower. Like the fragile monarchy, the Elizabethan church equally sought the validation of a connective history pre-dating the papacy,¹⁴³ a matter also of cogent political concern to Cecil. Together with Cotton, the three were responsible for saving much valuable material formally in the custody of the monasteries. The idea advanced by Leland for a national library was not, however taken up by them,¹⁴⁴ and the material remained in the personal possession and control of these powerful men.

Cecil was also involved with the compiling and printing of Holinshed's Chronicles and the first edition was dedicated to him in 1577.¹⁴⁵ But his most famous patronage of historical research was fulsomely acknowledged by the recipient, William Camden, in his dedication to Cecil of Britannia when it was first published in 1586.¹⁴⁶ The book was ordered geographically by county, the physical territory with which the sixteenth-century reader would most readily have identified and which had been given accurate visual expression in Saxton's series of county maps, published in the late 1570s. It was the means by which local administration such as the Justices of the Peace, the Sheriffs and the Lieutenants, as well as the military musters were organised. The importance of Britannia was immediately recognised. It went into many editions and displayed a much wider European outlook than that of traditional English antiquarians, and was to a large extent based on Camden's own primary research.¹⁴⁷ In Rowse's view it signalled the moment when "Tudor scholarship attained its majority".¹⁴⁸ Camden's approach got away from Sidney's jaundiced view of the historian who

"loaden with old mouse-eaten records authorises himself (for the most part) upon other histories whose greatest authorities are built upon the notable foundation of heresay"¹⁴⁹

Although it was not published until later in James I reign, in the introduction to the Annals of Great Britain in the Reign of Elizabeth, Camden further acknowledged that it was Cecil who had first suggested this undertaking and had put his state papers, as well as

his historic manuscripts at Camden's disposal for the purpose.¹⁵⁰ The book was published in Latin, aimed at a European as well as a home market.

As in Britannia, history and geography were commonly approached as closely bound aspects of the same chorographic knowledge that Cecil was interested in as part of the apparatus of the state. Cecil is recognized as having played a key part in the important development of cartography in the sixteenth century.¹⁵¹ In 1563 Laurence Nowell wrote to him that

"I observe most honoured Sir, that above all other monuments of the noble arts, you take especial pleasure in geographical maps, and that you know how to make good use of them in your office to render unceasing service of all kinds of state."¹⁵²

Nowell, who was one of the most able cartographers of the period, was angling for support to undertake the systematic and accurate mapping of England, pleading that it would be a "monument to your name not to be despised."¹⁵³ Cecil did not take this up, although he did own a very fine folding map of England and Scotland, embellished with personal references to himself which Nowell must have produced especially for him.¹⁵⁴ Between 1574-78, however, he was to be supplied with proofs of the early states of William Saxton's county maps which had been officially commissioned by the queen through the Privy Council, almost certainly at Cecil's behest.¹⁵⁵ Cecil was as reluctant to use the crown's over-stretched resources as he was his own, and eager to attract finance from the private sector wherever possible. In this case the lawyer and keen topographer, Thomas Seckford, sponsored the undertaking and Cecil's patronage was exercised more obliquely by securing for Seckford the surveyorship of the Court of Wards.¹⁵⁶ Cecil endorsed his proof of the map of Lincolnshire - his "native county"¹⁵⁷ - "1576 the first print corrected",¹⁵⁸ and on his copies of the maps generally made informed additions and corrections to place names, lists of Justices of the Peace and gentry, genealogies, notes on coastal defence and local military musters, with tables of roads and landmarks on

intersecting leaves.¹⁵⁹ This in itself gives an intimate glimpse of Cecil's working practice and the advantage he took of being able to plot the closely interconnected social and political geography of the nation on an accurate visualisation of the country, county by county, in the manner referred to by Nowell in 1563.¹⁶⁰

Cecil built up a huge collection of plans and maps covering all parts of the world, many annotated in his own hand, which were obviously as much working tools as connoisseur's collection. A number of competent sketch maps as well as plans of buildings and gardens that are entirely drawn by him survive.¹⁶¹ He had copies of both contemporary editions of Ortelius's Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, and his Grangerized edition of the atlas, with many notes by him, and including John Dee's map of England and Europe, is still at Burghley House.

As well as providing accurate administrative ground plans of the state, Saxton's maps gave the country mansions, including Theobalds and Burghley, the same graphic status as a small town. The family seat of Burghley from which Cecil took his eponymous title in 1571, put him literally as well as metaphorically "on the map". Saxton produced a wall-map version of the whole country, measuring some 4ft 9ins x 6ft (1.44m x 1.82m), printed in 1583. This exquisitely produced hanging was designed for display as much as for use, and like other maps and charts became a fashionable status accessory of the Elizabethan house. Nowell's "monuments of the noble arts"¹⁶² were used by Elizabethan patrons as part of the intellectual furniture to "beautify their Halls, Parlers, Chambers, Galleries, Studies or Libraries with".¹⁶³ Papers incriminating the Duke of Norfolk in the Ridolfi plot, for instance, were described as having been found in his London house "under a mat and by the window's side where the map of England doth hang."¹⁶⁴ At Theobalds Cecil had a terrestrial globe "twelve spans across".¹⁶⁵ The Green Gallery in the east range above the entrance there, as described by Waldstein in 1600, was decorated with

"the coats-of-arms of the earls and barons of England: all round the walls are trees painted in green, one tree for every county in England, and from their boughs hang the arms of those earls, barons, and nobles who live in that particular county. The specialities of any county are included, so if one them is outstandingly rich in flocks and herds it has them painted also"¹⁶⁶

In a document dated 1588 in Cecil's hand, he made a comprehensive list entitled "Noblemen, Bishops, great Officers, belonging to ye Queen, their names from the beginning of the reign to this time. All to be represented upon Trees of several kinds... Theobalds"¹⁶⁷ which was to be used for the iconographic scheme of the gallery. This role of honour can be seen as indicative of the public, institutional purpose of Theobalds in which Cecil conflated the identity of places and persons of consequence, including himself, to constitute the body of the nation itself. The traditional tree image of the genealogical map advertised on his walls was the ideal vehicle for expressing the 'natural' and permanent nature of that relationship.

Though Cecil failed to support Nowell's cartographic ambitions when he made his proposal in 1563, Nowell was the recipient of Cecil's patronage at the time as a member of Cecil's household, acting as tutor to the Earl of Oxford and transcribing and researching Cecil's manuscript collection.¹⁶⁸ Nowell was an experienced scholar who had studied at both Oxford and Cambridge, as well as in Germany and Italy. His cousin was also part of Cecil's network as Attorney to the Court of Wards.¹⁶⁹ Nowell was able to pursue his interest in history and language through his access to Cecil's manuscripts. He was acknowledged by Camden, who taught himself Anglo-Saxon in the course of his researches, as instrumental in the revival of interest and study of Anglo-Saxon scholarship.¹⁷⁰ He compiled a combined map-cum-index of Saxon England and Saxon place names as well as his famous but unpublished Anglo-Saxon dictionary.¹⁷¹

Cecil's interest in the scholarship of what Spenser was to describe as the "Kingdom of our own language"¹⁷² can be understood from various aspects: to increase

its potential for persuasive rhetorical power (although this was turned as a weapon against Cecil, amongst others by Spenser himself); to improve it as a tool of communication in the administration by increased standardization and better classification; and to encourage English as a European language of equal, if not superior, status to its rivals as an essential tool of confident national identity. Humanist scholars such as Cecil's friend, Sir Thomas Smith, identified a dynamic and eloquent language as one of the essential features that had contributed to the successful creation and maintenance of the Roman Empire.¹⁷³ According to the translator and geographer Richard Eden writing to Cecil in 1562, ambitions for the English language that built partly on those of Rome, were already being realised. Although he was no doubt blowing his own trumpet as a translator, he could justly claim that English

"has hitherto been accounted barbarous much more than it now is... before it was enriched and amplified by sundry books, in the manner of all arts, translated out of Latin and other languages." ¹⁷⁴

Eden was an associate of Nowell's and another Cambridge man to whom Cecil gave support and whose scholarship ranged over a broad field. He had been Cecil's private secretary for a time from 1552,¹⁷⁵ publishing his translation of Münster's Cosmography in 1553, followed by numerous other translations on various scientific subjects including anatomy and navigation and his own most famous collection of travel writing, The Decades of the Newe Worlde.¹⁷⁶

The whole pattern of Cecil's own multifarious but interconnected interests and pursuits was reflected in the encyclopaedic theme that ran through the house and garden at Theobalds. As well as the scientific schema mentioned above, the theme that linked history, geography and genealogy in the iconography of the "Green Gallery" continued through the house. The loggia facing onto the great garden was

"well painted with the Kinges and Queenes of England and the pedigree of the old Lord Burghley and divers other ancient families, with paintinges of many castles and battailes, with divers subscriptions on the walls".¹⁷⁷

In the great gallery, where there were "representations of the principal emperors and knights of the Golden Fleece with the most splendid cities in the world and their garments and fashions",¹⁷⁸ the idea was given an international dimension. Meanwhile, in the garden, busts of the twelve Roman emperors formed a semi-circle before a bathing house that was decorated with "appropriate episodes from history", and there were more sculptures and portraits of the imperial band in the house, together with those of kings of England and leading contemporary European figures.¹⁷⁹

The representations of the good and the great of the civilized world of Europe stood in counterpoint to the exotic primitivism of its pre-history, and of the new world, as yet not under its influence. A fantastic grotto encrusted with coloured stones was peopled with figures of a wildman and woman and a bronze centaur, while under the entrance arch Baron Waldstein noted in 1600 a large "picture showing Brazilians in their native dress".¹⁸⁰

In 1592 Rathgeb, who remarked that the house "is reckoned one of the most beautiful houses in England, as in truth it is" noted particularly "a very high rock of all colours, made of real stones, out of which gushes a splendid fountain that falls into a large circular bowl or basin, supported by two savages" ¹⁸¹ which may well have been, as Beckingsale suggests, devised from the "rock or mountain" sent to Cecil by Edward Kelly from Germany where such geological models made up of different rocks and demonstrating mining techniques, were popular items. Cecil told Kelly he would "place it in my house where I bestow other things of workmanship." ¹⁸²

A highly artificial conceit which brought the natural world even more theatrically into the interior space also impressed Rathgeb and his master, the Duke of Wirtemberg

"on each side of the hall are six trees, having the natural bark so artfully joined with bird's nests and leaves as well as fruit upon them, ...when the steward of the house opened the windows, which looked upon the beautiful pleasure gardens, birds flew into the hall, perched themselves on the trees and began to sing".¹⁸³

The description suggests the structure may have alluded to Vitruvius' account of the origins and evolution of the dwelling house in which he details how "some, in imitation of the nests of swallows and the way they build, made places of refuge out of mud and twigs",¹⁸⁴ and the passage continues with his familiar reference to the explanation of classical architecture, originating from primitive dwellings supported by the columnar trunks of trees.¹⁸⁵

Equally ingenious artificial aids were employed in the garden where fountains were fitted with hydraulic pressure mechanisms designed to spray the unwary when they passed over the hidden triggers, a device popular in Italian gardens. There were demonstration working watermills and model ships floating in a pool.¹⁸⁶ At the centre of the inner most court, overlooked by the private apartments planned for the queen's use, was another fountain with figures of Venus and Cupid¹⁸⁷ while in the outer garden a French visitor in 1640 still found "une petite eminence, qui l'on appelle la Montagne de Venus, au milieu d'un labyrinthe, qui forme un des plus beaux lieux du monde" that had already been remarked upon by earlier visitors.¹⁸⁸ Elsewhere in the garden was an obelisk with a figure of Christ at its apex,¹⁸⁹ and on a chimneypiece embellished with the Cecil garbs, there was a low relief panel combining the ideals of Christianity with those of the Classical world. Minerva, one of the female typologies identified with the queen, was depicted driving out Discord, overthrowing Idolatry and restoring true Religion.¹⁹⁰

In the gardens there were pleached allies, knot gardens and vine walks, and a wilderness. The whole microcosm could be encompassed by boats on the canals that surrounded them.¹⁹¹ Sporting facilities included a bowling alley, archery butts and bathing pool, besides the hawking and hunting in the park beyond.

Theobalds must have provided the ideal environment within which to flatter the queen, entertain and impress the court, and the international clientele to whom Cecil so frequently played host. The preamble to the Act of Parliament sanctioning the exchange of Theobalds for Hatfield between Cecil's son, Robert, and King James in 1607, as mentioned above, lists the amenities at Theobalds, "so commodious for the residence of his Highnes Court and entertaynement of forrayne Princes or their ambassadors upon all occasions". It reads, within its own terms of reference, like the publicity hand-out for a top-rate conference centre of the 1990s.¹⁹² Strong affinities between the descriptions of the great chamber and upper chamber and the decoration of the 1581 banquetting house put up at Whitehall suggest Cecil had a clear understanding of the sort of virtuoso devices that would appeal to urbane European visitors and English courtier-diplomats, accustomed to lavish and extravagant political entertainments. The banquetting house was specifically designed as the centre-piece of the propaganda programme for the reception of the French ambassadors who came to negotiate a marriage between Queen Elizabeth and the Duke of Alençon in 1581. Cecil was involved in drawing up the programme for this visit¹⁹³ and quite probably had a say in the schema chosen for the banquetting house:

"...in the top of this house was wrought most cunninglie upon canvas; works of iuie and hollie, with pendants made of wicker rods, and garnished with baie, rue and all manner of strange flowers garnished with spangles of gold, and also beautified with hanging toseans made of hollie and iuie, with all manner of strange fruits ... Betwixt these works... were great spaces of canvas, which was most cunninglie painted, the clouds with starres, the sunne and the sunne beames..."¹⁹⁴

When von Wedel visited the Banqueting House he was given a similar account to Rathgeb's description of Theobalds, being "told that birds sang in the bushes overhead while the entertainments were in progress"¹⁹⁵

Unlike the descriptions of the highly schematic live entertainments laid on by Cecil's rival, Leicester, for the queen's progress visit to Kenilworth in 1575, where the whole landscape was brought into play,¹⁹⁶ those of Theobalds quoted above are by tourists visiting the empty house and grounds. While Theobalds was obviously a major tourist attraction, their accounts were made without the benefit of a well-informed guide to interpret any overall meaning behind the various exotic schemata. Rather than dismissing Theobalds as merely a dazzling and vulgar show of random novelties, a Wunderkammer, as these accounts tend to imply, it is far more consistent with Cecil's strategic approach to everything in which he invested time and money to see the whole environment that he created at Theobalds as having a more calculated purpose - a topos which contained a much more politically powerful representation of the sort of inclusive and interactive "Description of the whole, and universall frame of the world"¹⁹⁷ which John Dee also described in his preface to Billingsley's Euclid. Within this unity, Dee expounded, "Man is called from the beginning 'Microcosmus' (that is, The Lesse World.) And for whose sake, and service, all bodily creatures els, were created: Who also participateth with Spirites, and Angels: and is made in the Image and similitude of God." In Dee's homo-centric "Lesse World" man, through wide and diligent study, could reach a state whereby "the Heaven, the Earth, and all other Creatures, will eche shew and offer thier Harmonious service....and with your own Experience, concluding: you may Methodically register the whole for posteritie: Whereby, good profe will be had, of our Harmonious, and Michrocosmicall constitution".¹⁹⁸

When Theobalds functioned, as it so frequently did, as a venue for politics under private ownership, the metaphor, including the working demonstrations of a "Harmonious

and Michrocosmical constitution" would have automatically signified not only as a personal expression for Cecil as the uomo universale, registering the breadth of his interests and learning, but also as an image of the totality of the civilization of the state under the monarchy of Elizabeth. Cecil's microcosm may not have gone quite as far as Dee's Cabalistic aspirations to participate with "Spirites and Angels", but under the guise of a pleasure park and hospitality centre one can infer an encrypted political message conveying the idea of an ambitious and successful state. The garden as a metaphor for the state is a familiar literary trope, but here the idea is expanded through the whole environment. The mood is different from the medieval concept of an enclosed alternative paradise garden protected by a fortified house. Its fantasy is of a world looking outwards to the discoveries of the new world, able to harness the wonders of scientific technology to its own devices, but at the same time, located harmoniously within the 'natural' hierarchies of the universe and of its own history and establishment, relative to the civilized world.

Cecil as Architectural Patron ¹⁹⁹

In tandem with the development of his personal buildings and their surroundings, Cecil had a close and continuing involvement with the commissioning of public buildings. The first documentary evidence of his association with the programme of state architecture, which was to develop rapidly in Elizabeth's reign, can be traced back to the Edwardian period. In 1551 Lawrence Bradshaw, the Surveyor of the Office of the Royal Works, submitted his account for erecting a banqueting house in Hyde Park, which, like that built at Whitehall in 1581, was designed specifically for the entertainment of an embassy from France.²⁰⁰ It was a joint venture with the Office of Revels and the dual responsibility led to differences between Bradshaw and Sir Thomas Cawarden, Master of the Revels. Cawarden enclosed a letter with Bradshaw's account, informing Cecil that he could not agree the figures because Bradshaw had not made him privy to it.²⁰¹ Cecil's role at this stage was financial and administrative. But he must already have been considered competent to have the senior men involved airing their dispute to him. Equally he must

have been deemed capable of judging the worth of the various tasks involved to serve the needs of the crown in the creation of an important propaganda stage designed to address and to accommodate influential representatives of a foreign power.

During Mary's reign his architectural interests were concentrated on Burghley, the family seat and potential political platform. However, by June 1559, only a few months after Elizabeth's accession, his involvement with the Royal Works had already been resumed. The Lord Treasurer, William Paulet, Marquess of Winchester, wrote to Cecil regarding urgent restoration work needed at Windsor, particularly in the area of the queen's lodgings.²⁰² He reported more details to Cecil in August and instructions for the undertakings, presumably as worked out by Winchester and Cecil, were given to the Surveyor John Revell, and work began in March 1560, with a running expenditure averaging between £350 - £400 per annum recorded up to 1567.²⁰³ It was to Cecil also that the Earl of Rutland wrote in 1562, describing how unfit the King's Manor at York was as a venue for an expected state meeting between Elizabeth and Mary Queen of Scots, but adding that new building had begun "as will appear by the plat thereof sent by the bearer".²⁰⁴

In 1563 Winchester was again consulting Cecil, this time over the designs for Henry VIII's still unfinished tomb for which new plans and elevations were being prepared for its installation in St George's Chapel, Windsor.²⁰⁵ The realisation of the tomb had remained unresolved through Edward and Mary's reigns, and was to continue so through Elizabeth's, although large sums were spent on designs and models for what would have been an important Renaissance monument. The 1563 designs were evidently by an English sculptor, for Winchester expressed his hope to Cecil that the queen would accept them and they could thus avoid using a foreign "workman".²⁰⁶ In 1565, Richard Rowlands is documented as having submitted plans, elevations and a model of the tomb.²⁰⁷ Rowlands was responsible for the carving of the important commission for the classically styled fountain of 1567-70 at Greenwich,²⁰⁸ so the queen must have approved of his work.

Cecil continued to be consulted over the tomb and more plans were sent to him in July 1567.²⁰⁹ Further plans and models were commissioned at considerable cost up to the mid 1570s, after which it seems to have been shelved altogether. Even so, it is an interesting illustration of the degree to which plans and models were being used in the design process of a project by the Royal Works and of Cecil's role not only in administration, but in exercising his judgement over the proposals.

In 1563 Cecil had been appointed with the Lord Keeper, the Earl of Pembroke to "execute the office of Treasurer during the sickness of the Marquess of Winchester".²¹⁰ How long this situation lasted is not recorded, but with regard to the Royal Works at least, he seems to have taken on much of Winchester's responsibility from this time. The most fruitful period of the Works activity during Elizabeth's reign coincided with the opening years of the surveyorship of Lewis Stockett, which also began in December 1563. Cecil was instrumental in drawing up a new patent to reform the practices of the office after the discovery of financial abuses under the previous holder.²¹¹ Winchester's suggestions to Cecil that the roles of paymaster and surveyor should be separated were not put into effect.²¹² The "certain amount of muddle"²¹³ that Summerson notes regarding the appointment of Stockett can perhaps be attributed to the change of responsibility between Winchester and Cecil. The money for the Works operations was in future still to be largely raised directly from the Exchequer but lesser funds from a further bewildering labyrinth of sources were rationalized and accountability was generally tightened. In theory, this allowed for a more vigorous centralised financial control of the sort that Cecil favoured, although in practice the financial structure of the Works remained extremely precarious and generally under-funded.²¹⁴ Nevertheless, a comprehensive programme to refurbish and modernize the complex of buildings in Westminster housing the most important offices of the administration was initiated in 1563 under Stockett's new management.

So too was the refurbishment of its neighbour, Whitehall Palace, the headquarters of the court during Elizabeth's monarchy.²¹⁵ Although there is no documentary evidence, Winchester, as Summerson suggests, may well have been the driving force behind these

initiatives. However, it is equally likely that Cecil encouraged these much needed reforms to the government's administrative hub which was at the same time the centre of his own increasingly important power base. The work included, for instance, the re-housing of the Court of Wards,²¹⁶ to which Cecil had been appointed Master in March 1560/1.

On the evidence available, the ultimate directorship of the Works cannot be precisely determined, but a very conservative estimate of Cecil's role by the beginning of the 1570s, puts him as probably the most active and influential member of a small sub-committee of the Privy Council ultimately responsible for the Works.²¹⁷ This seems to have consisted of its financial arm with the Chancellor, Walter Mildmay and the Keeper of the Seal, Nicholas Bacon, involved at various times. There is no evidence, however, of officers reporting directly to them or of their initiating, rather than merely endorsing, detailed instructions to the officers of the Works. By contrast, there are numerous examples of Cecil acting in this capacity and there are strong indications of his extensive control in the matter of Works affairs, particularly in the field of military architecture.²¹⁸ Although as Secretary, and then as Lord Treasurer in his own right from 1572, Cecil's role was technically administrative and financial, there is a steady flow of references in the Works' documents throughout Elizabeth's reign that point to his playing a more creative role and he was kept personally in touch even with minor works.²¹⁹ This included detailed involvement in design decisions and initiatives, albeit within the framework of tight financial constraint that characterised the state building programme. More than anyone else in the top echelon of government, Cecil appears to have been treated as ultimately in charge of the Works, judging or questioning information from the officers and deciding where the money should be spent. In 1573, for instance, the payment to the mason who was advising on various tasks at Fotheringhay Castle, actually refers to him as "Haward my Lo. Treasurer Masson".²²⁰ The Castle was only a few miles away from Burghley where masons were at work on a new porch in 1573.²²¹ Stone and lead for use at Burghley was bought by Cecil at an advantageous price from the Lady Chapel of Fotheringhay church which was being demolished at the time,²²² and it seems probable

that Cecil was in this case supplying one of his own men who may have been working at Burghley, as a consultant to the Works.

The Works had become accustomed to direct command and hands-on involvement from the very top under Henry VIII, that "perfect builder as well of fortresses as of pleasant palaces".²²³ There was a group of expert consultants and officers beneath, but Henry, when he chose, was consulted over planning, appointments, design and financial decisions, and sometimes devised plans himself.²²⁴ He was the final arbiter of the organisation particularly over the co-ordinated policy of coastal fortification.²²⁵ During Edward VI's reign the Duke of Somerset, whose building expenditure on his own houses is estimated at some £17,000 (£10,000 on Somerset House alone),²²⁶ appears to have taken on a similar role to Henry in the programme to modernise the fortifications on the Scottish borders.²²⁷

In contrast to her father, the queen showed little interest in becoming directly involved in the initiation or administration of the Royal Works, leaving a vacancy that Cecil appears to have been very ready to fill. In the 1570s and 1580s he was also closely involved with the only significant architectural project of this "architecturally unimportant queen",²²⁸ the new gallery, terrace and banqueting house at Windsor, where Elizabeth spent some time every year from 1563.²²⁹

Windsor had its own Office of Works but, despite the fact that the Earl of Leicester was Constable of the Castle, when building and maintenance costs were spiralling in 1575 it was to Cecil that Humphrey Michell, the surveyor there, offered his resignation.²³⁰ This was not accepted, but responsibility in future was split between Michell, John Norris the Comptroller, and Henry Hawthorn, who now assumed responsibility for supplies and appointment of craftsmen and labourers.²³¹ These orders were officially issued by Leicester but in November 1576 it was again to Cecil that Michell wrote about the works, specifically asking Cecil to instruct Hawthorn to draw up the plans for the new work

requested by the queen.²³² The work at Windsor was not carried out until 1582-4 by which time the queen was familiar with galleries at Theobalds with which Hawthorn may also have been involved.²³³ The officers at Windsor continued to report to Cecil and as late as 1588 "the Clerk of the honor and castell" was detailing works to be done to Cecil.²³⁴

There is no record of Hawthorn after 1577, but John Symonds, whose association with Cecil's building works has been covered elsewhere, seems to have taken on a significant role in Cecil's private projects from this date.²³⁵ Symonds died a relatively wealthy man in 1597,²³⁶ no doubt to a considerable degree as a result of benefiting from his dual role in the architecture of the state and that of its chief minister.

The bulk of the of the non-military undertakings and expenditure of the Royal Works during Elizabeth's reign was concerned with essential maintenance and relatively small add-on projects - often in response to an anticipated progress visit from the queen and court - to the huge portfolio of royal properties which Elizabeth inherited. The more creative design possibilities offered by the numerous and often hastily constructed short-term buildings used for propaganda set-pieces, like the banqueting houses at Hyde Park and Whitehall, lay in their fictive architecture and extravagant decorations. While these might make reference to the very latest architectural ideas, they were handled largely by the Revels Office. The opportunity for talented and ambitious officers of the Works to be involved with architecture on a grander and more permanent scale at Theobalds or Burghley, even if Cecil was calling the shots, must have been an attractive one. Conversely, Cecil was in the perfect position to head-hunt the most able men from within the professional organisation of the Works for his personal building activities.

Those involved in military architecture, however, had greater opportunities within the Works at the outset of Elizabeth's reign. England was at war with France and Scotland and strengthening the defensive architecture was one of the urgent items on the agenda that

Cecil drew up for the first meeting of the Privy Council following Elizabeth's accession in November 1558.²³⁷ By December 1558 Sir Leonard Chambers, governor of Castle Cornet in Guernsey, was appealing directly to him for help on the grounds that the castle was in no fit state to withstand attack.²³⁸ Meanwhile, Cecil was taking the volatile situation at the other end of the realm in Scotland extremely seriously, and urged in the same year that the chief border fortress and garrison town of Berwick-on-Tweed should be strengthened in manpower by three to four thousand men.²³⁹ Cecil's subsequent skilful handling of the diplomatic situation and peace negotiations is not unexpected.²⁴⁰ But the extent to which the documents indicate that he was consulted and appealed to over matters of military architecture and engineering strategy is a significant development. Unlike Henry VIII and Somerset, Cecil was not a soldier. His only experience in the field was with Somerset at the Battle of Pinkie.²⁴¹ Cecil's position, therefore, marks a change from a military commander overseeing the strategy for military installations to someone whose grasp of modern theories of military architecture can only have been intellectually based. Nowhere is his involvement more apparent than at Berwick, and as it is fairly well documented, it may serve as an example of the important hands-on role Cecil was playing in the directorship of the Works.

Cecil's understanding of the revolution that had taken place in modern defence architecture must already have been quite well developed by the beginning of Elizabeth's reign. Following the triumph at Pinkie in 1547,²⁴² Somerset instigated the overhaul of the border defences including Berwick, adopting comprehensively, in intention at least, the modern Italian-type fortification plans which Henry VIII had begun to take up for his coastal defences after 1538.²⁴³ Cecil was in Somerset's household by 1547 and, given his subsequent authority on the subject, it is reasonable to assume that he was privy to the documents and plans for this important project. The only foreign fortifications in the Italian manner that Cecil could have seen first-hand were at Antwerp on his trip in 1556, and there were as yet no treatises covering the latest developments in military architecture. The new 'Italian' strategy moved away from high, concentrically disposed stone-walled structures

with rounded bastions, to low-lying constructions with earth infills to absorb the shock of high-velocity artillery, together with straight-edged angle bastions to allow flanking fire and better cover against undermining.

The nature of these concepts, which were being widely adopted throughout Europe by the middle of the century, seems to have been familiar within Cecil's circle. In 1554 for instance, Thomas Hoby recorded in his diary that Lignago in Italy was "well fortified on both sides with square boulevards, low after the new fashion without flankers".²⁴⁴ As mentioned above, Cecil would almost certainly have had access to this diary and would have been able to discuss such items in detail with Hoby. In 1566, when Hoby was on his way to take up his appointment as ambassador in Paris, he wrote to Cecil of how he had been prevented by the French from seeing the "new devices"²⁴⁵ of their latest fortification programme at Calais which he had been keen to observe, suggesting that his interest was more than one of personal curiosity.²⁴⁶

By 1559 Cecil was obviously already dealing with fortification and acquainted with the work of Italian experts in the "new fashion" for Sir Nicholas Throckmorton recommended Jacopo Contio to him, though added that he was not as experienced in this field as Giovanni Portinari,²⁴⁷ a military architect and strategist who had worked for Henry VIII and then in France during Edward and Mary's reigns.

Cecil's belief in the value of working from accurate maps and plans made him well equipped for dealing with military architecture, and he amassed a huge collection of drawings and plans of military installations, now at Hatfield House. The practice of making scale plans for fortifications appears to have been first introduced in England in the 1540s at the same time as Italian-style fortifications were being adopted.²⁴⁸ Plans drawn up for Berwick were in the main based on accurately gauged surveys and drawn to scale. One by Rowland Johnson showing the lie of the land surrounding the town as well as the fortifications makes use of a double scale.²⁴⁹ It was essential that all who were involved

in developing these complex installations could work and communicate through maps and plans and comprehend projected built forms through these conceptual means, when decisions often had to be made remotely from the site "by plott alone".²⁵⁰

In August 1559 Sir Ralph Sadler was detailed to liaise with Sir Richard Lee over the situation at Berwick, calling on his way also to view and assess Cecil's building work at Burghley.²⁵¹ His "private and public instructions were both drafted by Cecil."²⁵² Despite Somerset's endeavours Sadler confirmed that although the fortifications looked "fayer",²⁵³ a great deal would have to be spent at Berwick to make the town safe.²⁵⁴ In January 1560 the Lieutenant-General of the North, the young Duke of Norfolk, informed Cecil that Berwick was "marvelous unapt for to be fortyfyd, without great payne, travell and industrie".²⁵⁵ Daniele Barbaro, it seems had been deceived about the state of its development. Norfolk detailed the problems to Cecil and suggested possible alternatives for action and further consultation with experts.²⁵⁶ There followed a formal recommendation to Cecil from the Council of the North that in this case experts in the field needed to be sent to view the site rather than making their judgements only from plans.²⁵⁷ Giovanni Portinari, the Italian specialist mentioned by Throckmorton to Cecil in 1559, went and was followed by the return of Sir Richard Lee, the equally experienced Englishman. Cecil visited the site himself, after his successful negotiation of the Treaty of Edinburgh in July 1560, by which time tensions between Portinari and Lee were apparent.²⁵⁸

Following the treaty, the immediate threat of attack had diminished, but concerns over Berwick and the progress of work there continued, and it was to Cecil that these were addressed. In October 1561 an estimate of work required came to £50, 245 11s 0d, a huge sum that was in fact to be far exceeded during Elizabeth's reign - reaching £130,000 by 1570,²⁵⁹ and creating what Summerson describes as "no less than a garrison town equal in strength to any in Europe".²⁶⁰

Reports and complaints continued to land in Cecil's lap. Between 20th May 1561 and 21st April 1562 he had nine letters from Jenyson, the Comptroller at Berwick, alone. In March, for instance, Jenyson was having trouble with the English masons.²⁶¹ Cecil also had correspondence during this period with Lord Grey, the Governor, and Johnson, the Deputy Surveyor.²⁶² In 1564 Lee and Portinari were back in Berwick, this time with the same Contio previously recommended to Cecil.²⁶³ There were still differences of opinion between the experts over design policy. Following a letter to Cecil at the beginning of 1565, he must have put the situation to the Privy Council, and a comprehensive formal report, to be delivered in person by Johnson, was demanded.²⁶⁴ Cecil then devised an empirical experimental test, laying down the strictly controlled conditions (which included taking account of anticipated bias against the Italian's design by the English workforce). He proposed the building of sample sections of the alternative wall designs which should then be subjected to the same firepower.²⁶⁵ Cecil disclosed in a memorandum that his purpose in setting up this elaborate test was not confined to the particular situation at Berwick, but was to determine a standard wall defence pattern for future application.²⁶⁶ It was an attempt, in fact, to establish a coherent piece of architectural practice from a scientifically based experiment. Estimates of the costs of the trial were drawn up and there is a plan and report on the alternative designs in the Hatfield collection.²⁶⁷ Whether this exercise was completed or not, Cecil it appears was the key figure to whom the experts reported concerning these highly technical and contentious matters. It was he who frequently acted as the executive officers' spokesman in the Privy Council, and he who would have been instrumental in making the ultimate decision on a potentially extremely important aspect of future military architectural policy.

As with the crown's domestic properties, the documents concerning minor works on fortifications indicate that Cecil's involvement was comprehensive and that he was regularly consulted and deferred to by the officers of the Works throughout the reign. He was involved in one way or another with all the major undertakings, such as the huge redevelopment of Dover Harbour where his experience of land reclamation in the Fens must

have been of considerable value.²⁶⁸ During the last ten years of his life, following the Armada, a more formal defence policy than had been in place in the middle years of Elizabeth's reign was reinstated, and several talented military designers emerged within the Royal Works. By this time Walsingham and Lord Cobham were also closely involved with aspects of the Works, but it was still to Cecil that Paul Ivey reported in 1593 over the proposals for Elizabeth Castle, ultimately leading to the go-ahead for phase one of this huge project.²⁶⁹ It was the largest and most modern of very few completely new-builds of its namesake's reign. Ivey was a leading fortifications expert and another Cambridge man, who had graduated in the 1560s. He was the translator of a well-known French work on the subject and in 1589 had published his own treatise on military architecture,²⁷⁰ a copy of which was in the Hatfield library in 1614.²⁷¹

Robert Adams who became Surveyor of the Royal Works in 1594, had a similarly academic rather than craftsman's background to Ivey's. He was one of the most skilled cartographers and draughtsmen of the period, and architect of domestic as well as military buildings.²⁷² Both men were typical of the new professionals who were emerging throughout the administration by the end of Cecil's regime. Like Ivey, Adams reported to Cecil, in this case regarding the situation in the Scilly Isles where he was supervising the building of Star Castle in 1593.²⁷³ A covering letter from the Governor of the Islands highly recommended Adams to Cecil and Adams himself hoped that Cecil would further his cause with the queen, probably for the appointment of Surveyor, which was duly forthcoming.²⁷⁴ His tenure was short-lived, however, for he died in 1595 leaving instructions to his brother that all his plans and papers, which must have included highly sensitive secret material, should go to Cecil's keeping. His brother was to pass on the name of a man Adams advised was "able in platt or model to set down such fortifications as Burghley should see fit to employ him about".²⁷⁵ Cecil it seems was still perceived as the director of the architectural strategy of defence policy.

Even in 1598, the year of Cecil's death, Lord Willoughby de Eresby, one of England's most experienced soldiers, still submitted his report on Berwick, where he had been appointed governor, to Cecil.²⁷⁶ He regarded what he found as a shockingly inadequate state of defences and supported his case with a graphic illustration of the site and a plan of proposals for remedies that Cecil would no doubt have appreciated. Berwick had never been put to the test and the relationship with Scotland had changed. James VI was now an ally and the most likely candidate to succeed Elizabeth. By 1589 Cecil had been remarking wryly upon the change whereby "we true Englishmen have cause for our own quietness to wish good success to a French King and a King of Scots".²⁷⁷ The border fortress was no longer a frontier town, and no money was allocated. De Eresby claimed that despite the huge sums spent at Berwick nothing had been completed and it was "a mere shewe and opinion of a stronge thinge".²⁷⁸ This concurs with Lord Hunsdon's views, voiced to Cecil twenty years before, that Berwick was poor and undefendable, even though its new outward shell was "very beautiful".²⁷⁹ Whether by design or default, as with so many other aspects of Elizabethan policy under Cecil, the value of Berwick to the state appears to have been artificially extended well beyond its actual capabilities. The propaganda of its reputation, already being swallowed by Barbaro in Edward VI's reign, and enhanced no doubt by the vast resources known to be devoted to it during Elizabeth's reign, in the event was more significant than its physical strength.

"I have ever thought your wares to be so good and saleable." Thus Cecil's friend, the Duchess of Suffolk, described the nature of Cecil's abilities and ambitions, already recognised in the most powerful circles by the end of Edward's reign.²⁸⁰ His wares may have been those of a "Clownish Englishman" but they were reliant upon a grasp of the most up-to-date information equal to that of the statesmen and diplomats of rival European powers with whom he was treating. Their marketability was also dependent upon a sound humanist classical education to provide both the cultural base and the methodological skill necessary to operate effectively within this international milieu which included some of Europe's leading intellectuals. At Cecil House, where he was already entertaining the

queen in 1561, its important public as well as private functions were meshed together from the very beginning of his ownership, while Theobalds, which was to become the principal centre of Cecil's political hospitality, was not even on the agenda until 1564, by which time the first phase of his development of Burghley was nearing completion. While Cecil was engaged on the first phase of building at Burghley he was already involved with major architectural projects for the state, many of which, like the Northamptonshire house, had to be ultimately controlled and sanctioned at long-distance. Here the political and financial restraints were his own and the personal attention he devoted to its building testify to the significance it held for him. Cecil's scholarly and cultural interests and the whole pattern of his personal and institutional patronage were woven into the fabric of his political life which was so indivisible from his private life, as were the houses in which he both lived and worked. In examining and interpreting the architecture and building history of Burghley House and its surroundings, the expectation must similarly be that it was informed by Cecil's cultural and intellectual make-up and his architectural experience as well as by his political ambition.

-
- 1 Girouard 1983, 5
 - 2 Summerson 1986, 55
 - 3 Summerson 1986, 55
 - 4 Summerson 1980, 30
 - 5 Lloyd 1931, 77
 - 6 Lloyd 1931, 61
 - 7 Gotch 1894 Vol 1, xx1
 - 8 Shorter OED 1965.
 - 9 Daniel Ed. Colby Sprague 1930, 490-493
 - 10 Cited in Yates 1969, 192, John Dee's translation of Vitruvius' De architectura I,1,iii in his preface to Henry Billingsley's translation of Euclid's Elements published 1570
 - 11 Girouard 1983, 5
 - 12 Summerson 1986, 55
 - 13 Cited in Yates, 192; John Dee's translation of Vitruvius' De architectura I,1, iii in his preface to Henry Billingsley's translation of Euclid's Elements published 1570
 - 14 Gordon 1949, 160-161 referring to A Tale in the Tub
 - 15 Gordon 1949, 170; in Love's Welcome at Bolsover , Jonson's final royal entertainment.
 - 16 Yates 1969, 191
 - 17 Vitruvius VI,8,X trans. Hicky Morgan 1960, 192
 - 18 Vitruvius VI, 8,X trans. Hicky Morgan 1960, 192
 - 19 Clapham Eds. Read & Read 1951, 80. John Clapham has been established by the Reads as the author of a short biography of William Cecil contained within the text of Certain Observations Concerning The Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth. Clapham was a member of Cecil's household and claimed to have been educated there as well. His father was a sponsored undergraduate at Pembroke College, Cambridge in 1559.
 - 20 Bacon 1597, in M. Hawkins ed. 1992, 150
 - 21 Bacon 1597, in M. Hawkins ed. 1992, 150
 - 22 Hudson 1980, 43
 - 23 McGrath 1993, 52
 - 24 Summerson 1986, 55
 - 25 Porter 1972, quoted from Erasmus Epistles II. 33
 - 26 Hudson 1980, 43-44
 - 27 For example, Read 1955, 24-28; Porter 1958; Hudson 1980
 - 28 Barnett 1969, 3
 - 29 Rogeri Aschami Epistolorum Libri Quattuor Ed. 1703, 201
 - 30 Read 1955, 41
 - 31 Richard Cecil settled lands in Lincolnshire and Rutland jointly on William and Mildred on their marriage, see chapter 2
 - 32 Read 1955, 34-5, Warnicke 1983, 105

-
- 33 William Maitland to Mildred Cecil, HMC Salisbury Vol I, 215, also HMC
Salisbury Vol 1, 785, and letter from the Earl of Arran to Mildred Cecil, 794
- 34 Warnicke 1983, 105
- 35 Sandeen (unpub. PhD thesis) 1959, 121, 178-200
- 36 Sandeen (unpub. PhD thesis) 1959, 268-70
- 37 Ellis 1843, ii, No 265
- 38 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 118, 36
- 39 See Castiglione Ed. Bull 1976, 13-14, in Bull's introduction to his translation of
the book.
- 40 Hoby Ed. Powell 1902, 4
- 41 Hoby Ed. Powell 1902. Numerous references throughout the diary, see for
instance p25 where he mentions Lucias Faunus, Martian and Biondo. Rome,p50
- 42 Hoby Ed. Powell 1902, 127
- 43 Hoby Ed. Powell 1902, for example 10, 117, 118, 119
- 44 Warnicke 1983, 106
- 45 Hayes and Murdin 1740-59, 755
- 46 See van Dorsten, 1981, 191-206 . Ascham, the most conservative of these Marian
exiles, spent much of his time in Italy although he was homesick for Cambridge.
Even before Mary came to the throne he was writing to Cecil from Brussels in
extremely obsequious terms, with a plea to be allowed to retire to Cambridge and
Greek research 24th March 1553, BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 3, 39 (reprinted in Ellis
1843 Vol 1 no 5) . John Cheke taught in Padua, as did Anthony Cooke, who also
attended Peter Martyr's lectures in Strasbourg in 1554 (see DNB 1975 entries
Cooke & Cheke and Hoby, Ed. Powell 1902)
- 47 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 3, 54
- 48 HMC Salisbury Series 9 Vol 1, 553 Anthony Cooke to Cecil, 24th January 1557
- 49 For example see Burgon 1839, Vol 1 306-7
- 50 See Chapter 2
- 51 Hoby Ed. Powell 1902
- 52 Lewis D. 1981, 370
- 53 Laven (unpub. PhD thesis) 1957, 119
- 54 Lewis 1981, 370
- 55 Laven (Thesis) 1957, 119 Barbaro was closely in touch with the intelligentsia of
England, including Philip Hoby during his embassy, when he was actively
promoting the work of Aretino
- 56 Cal SP Foreign, 1547-1553, no 353, 1551. Barbaro visited Scotland in 1550 (Laven
(unpub. PhD thesis) 1957, 116)
- 57 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 118, Cecil's list of places visited and expenditure cited in
Read 1955, 106.
- 58 See for example Read 1955 114; Read 1960, ; Skelton & Summerson 1971,
introduction by 5th Marquess of Salisbury
- 59 Quoted in Burgon Vol 1, 444
- 60 Burgon 1839, Vol 1, 255
- 61 Cal SP Foreign 1547-1553
- 62 Cal SP Foreign 1560-1561
- 63 Cal SP Foreign 28th September 1560, no 569
- 64 Read 1960, 45; Guerau de Spes, Cal SP Spanish 1568-1579, 364
- 65 Girouard 1983, 5
- 66 See for examples Laven (unpub. PhD thesis 1957) Ch 1, Tafuri 1989, 58, 193;
Ackerman 1982, 44 & Pullan, 1968, 107-9
- 67 See Chapter 2, and Kennedy 1983, 15-37

-
- 68 Cal SP Dom Elizabeth Addenda /25/67 Vol 103 no 3
69 Camden 1586 Ed. Gibson 1971, facsimile of the 1695 edition, 295*
70 See Chapter 4 for details of Cecil's interest in gardening.
71 Cal SP Dom. Dr. Andrew Perne to Wm. Cecil 25th March 1575 12/103/18
72 STC 1508,3744,3746,25852
73 Ellis, 1843 No 12, 32-40, 3rd October 1574
74 Beckingsale 1967, 260. A copy of Copernicus' de Revolutionibus Orbium
Caelestium published in Basle in 1566 is listed in the sale catalogue of what were
claimed to be Cecil's books the Bibliotheca Illustrissima see below for details fn
116
75 Rye 1865, 44
76 Waldstein f.150 Ed. Groos 1981, 85
77 SP Dom. 12/36/184-5, cited in van Dorsten 1969, 551
78 Van Dortsen 1969, 547, and Cal SP Foreign for numerous letters and intelligences
from Bizari to Cecil
79 Van Dortsen 1969, 546; SP Dom 12/47/15-20
80 Van Dorsten, 1981, 193
81 Van Dorsten 1981, 193. Van de Does wrote under his Latinized name as Janus
Dousa
82 Sidney Ed. Shepherd 1965, 96-98
83 Van Dorsten 1981, 198-199
84 Cal SP Foreign 1577, 467
85 Hurstfield 1949, 103-114
86 For example Laurence Nowell and Arthur Golding who was there with the Earl of
Oxford. Golding translated amongst other works Aretino, Justin, Ovid and in 1565
dedicated his translation of Caesar's Commentaries to Cecil (DNB 1975 & van
Dorsten 1969, 548; for Cecil's curriculum for the Earl of Oxford, Read 1960, 125)
87 Peck 1732-5, 32
88 Sinfield, A. 'The Cultural Politics of the Defence of Poetry' in Walker & Moore
Eds. 1984, 130
89 HMC Rutland Vol 1, 274-5
90 Peck 1732-5, 28
91 Even Thomas Cecil, customarily dismissed as without intellectual interests, (see
DNB, for example) was perhaps, as van Dorsten speculates "considered eligible
and prepared to take over Sidney's patronage at Leiden" (following Sidney's death
in 1586 when Thomas was in the Low Countries with Leicester, and a poem hinting
at such a role was dedicated to him). (Strong & van Dorsten 1964,64)
92 Ascham 1570 in Arber Ed. 1923, 17
93 Williams 1962 & STC
94 Read 1955, 57
95 Greg 1935, 262-265
96 Read 1955, 106 Chaloner to Cecil, Antwerp, 27 August & 10 Nov. 1559
97 DNB 1975
98 SP Dom 12/20/2
99 Peacham, 45; Aubrey noted that "Dr. J. Web in preface of his translation of
Cicero's Familiar Epistles" described how Cecil "made Cicero's Epistles his glass,
his oracle and his ordinary pocket-book" (Aubrey Ed. Barber 1982, 69)
100 SP Dom 12/20/2
101 Read 1955, 114. Thomas Hoby's translation of The Courtier was published by
William Seres in 1561 (Hoby, Ed. Powell 1902, 78 fn 1)

-
- 102 Barnett 1969, 118, Hatfield MSS 143/96
- 103 Read 1955, 11
- 104 Shepherd 1989, 93
- 105 Shepherd 1989, 104-5
- 106 Parker 1853, 254
- 107 Hatfield MSS P3/11448 A Catalogue of all Yor Lordship's printed bookes as they are now disposed in yor Lordship's librarye taken this 26th Januarie 1614 compiled by Thos Wilson and Christopher Keighley steward Transcript by Miss Talbot, 1231 titles at her count
- 108 Skelton 1971, 9, fn
- 109 Hatfield MSS P3/11448
- 110 Printed in Cabala Sive Scrivana 1691, 141, Sir Wm Cecil to the Right Honourable Sir Knight, Her Majesty's Ambassador, Resident in France. 27th August 1568.
- 111 Cal SP Foreign 1547-1553, No 522
- 112 Cal SP Foreign 1547-1553 No 516, 15th December 1551
- 113 Gent 1981, 67. Cecil's copy, with an endorsement to this effect in his hand on the title page is now in the Lambeth Palace Library, "Gulielui Ceciliij ex dono Nac. Thokmerton 1561" (Cousin 1560)
- 114 Cousin 1560, (there are no page numbers to text)
- 115 Gotch establishes this in Early Renaissance Architecture in England 299, but he does not give a reference. Subsequent printed references, as far as I have established all cite Gotch. I have been unable to find Gotch's source in the Public Records or HMC calendars or the Lansdowne Manuscript. However as Gotch's researches into the documents relating to Cecil's architecture are otherwise reliable this is taken as bona fide information.
- 116 Bibliotheca Illustrissima (London 1687)Wing B5726; Jayne's view is that the 249 manuscripts in the sale "were probably Burghley's but most of the published works were not". No reason is given for this opinion although a good number of the books were printed after Cecil's death so obviously they cannot have come from the "Library of that Famous Secretary William Cecil, Lord Burghleigh" as they are advertized in the catalogue. The books that date from the sixteenth century, however, comprise a very plausible collection for Cecil to have owned, including copies of books that he is documented as possessing. Adding books onto the genuine collection would have been a tempting marketing ploy, and does not necessarily invalidate the whole. Skelton and Summerson take a more open view that "as yet no positive evidence to determine whether these books were sent for sale by the 4th Earl of Exeter or the 4th Earl of Salisbury. They could have formed part of Burghley's upper library left to Thomas Cecil. A search of the family and estate papers at Hatfield House made by Miss Talbot has brought to light no reference to any sale of books at this date from Hatfield" (Skelton & Summerson) 1971, 9, fn)
- 117 Skelton & Summerson 1971, 10, fn. now in BL Sloane MSS 3651; Reference to date of 1572, Skelton & Summerson, 1971, 30
- 118 Bibliotheca Illustrissima 1687, Wing B5726
- 119 Simpson 1977, 7
- 120 Yates 1969, 34-36
- 121 Dee's Preface printed in Yates 1969, Appendix A,190-197. Yates considered it "one of the most important and influential books of the Elizabethan period" (p.5). National Building Records, Swindon; Burghley House File. Catalogue no 86 "Euclid, John Daye [publisher] 1570"
- 122 French 1972, 186 Dee's appreciation of Cecil's interest in mathematics has been referred to above, and while publicly Cecil distanced himself from Dee's more

-
- extreme ideas, like the queen he probably used him as his astrologer. (French 1972, 6; See Thomas 1985, 143 for indication of Cecil's interest in the subject)
- 123 Cecil had maps by Dee in his bound personal atlas, see below;
reference to reform of the calendar Beckingsale 1967, 260
- 124 Yates 1969 ,4 quoting F.R. Johnson, Astronomical Thought in Renaissance England (Baltimore, 1937) 138
- 125 Bibliotheca Illustrissima Wing B5726
- 126 See above, Levan (Thesis) 1957, 119
- 127 Ascham, printed in Ed. Wright 1904, 175
- 128 Hessels 1887, Vol 1 no 71. Ortelius came in order to find authentic material for his map of Roman Britain. The meeting with Camden was important; as Trevor Roper points out, "It brought his [Camden's] concept of Britain into a European framework and himself into the European Republic of Letters" (Trevor Roper 1975, 8)
- 129 Hessels 1887, no 72
- 130 SP Dom 12/19/1
- 131 For example Waldstein f.151 Ed. Groos 1981, 87, Hentzner Ed. Walpole 1758, 54
- 132 Camden 1586, Ed. Gibson 1971, facsimile of the 1695 edition, 296
- 133 SP Dom 12/20/43; Burgon Vol 2, 408, 178; SP Dom 12/42/19
- 134 SP Dom Addenda Elizabeth, 20/89
- 135 Yates 1985, 134-5 & illustrations 132
- 136 Yates 1985, 121-127
- 137 See Chapter 5
- 138 Yates 1985, 130
- 139 Guy 1991, 127-129 The Bull by Pius V entitled Regnam in Excelsis was issued in February and published in England by John Fenton in May 1570.
- 140 Kendrick 1950, 3; See also French 1972, 188 -207 for a good account of the antiquarian arguments in the sixteenth century and their historical background.
- 141 Cicero Eds Griffin & Aitkins 1991, in Griffin's introduction, xix
- 142 Greg 1935, 246
- 143 Trevor Roper 1971, 7
- 144 Greg 1935, 247
- 145 Rowse 1950, 53
- 146 Trevor Roper 1971, 6-7, 9
- 147 Trevor Roper 1971, 3-34
- 148 Rowse 1950, 32
- 149 Hurstfield 1972, 92
- 150 Trevor Roper 1971,10
- 151 Greenblatt Ed. 1988, 358 R. Helgerson 'The land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography and Subversion in Renaissance England'
- 152 Andrews 1961, 5
- 153 Skelton 1974, 9
- 154 Flower 1935, 61
- 155 Greenblatt ed. 1988, 358 R. Helgerson 'The land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography and Subversion in Renaissance England'
- 156 DNB 1975
- 157 SP Dom 12/20/40
- 158 Skelton 1974, 8
- 159 Cecil's proof set of Saxton's county maps is in British Library Royal MSS 18 D iii ff71v-72

-
- 160 Andrews 1961, 5
- 161 For example, 'Map of Liddesdale' by Cecil, SP 59/5/44, illustrated in Harvey
1993, 56; also Hatfield MSS 143/44, 143/37-38, 143/39
- 162 Andrews 1961, 5
- 163 Skelton & Summerson 1971, 7
- 164 Hayes & Murdin 1740-59, 67
- 165 Waldstein f.149 Ed. Groos 1981, 85
- 166 Waldstein f. 149 Ed. Groos 1981, 87. Gershow in 1602 also mentions that
depictions of the principal mountains and rivers were included in the scheme
(Gershow Ed. von Bülow 1892, 31)
- 167 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 104 f.24, dated 1588. One paragraph of the title page is in
cypher, but in the list he details different woods to be used for each category,
including black cherry and walnut for the most prestigious. This must refer to
the 'Greene Gallery' rather than the 'Great Chamber' because Cecil refers to the
latter in his defence of his houses made in 1585, where he claimed he was "forced
to enlarge the room" by the queen "which need not be envied of any for riches in
it, more than the shew of old oaks, and such trees with painted leaves and fruit"
(SP Dom 12/181/42 printed in Gent. Mag CVI, pt i, 149)
- 168 Flower 1935, 56
- 169 Laurence Nowell was formerly thought to be the same man as Laurence Nowell,
Dean of Lichfield, now identified as his cousin, Harvey 1993, 54
- 170 Flower 1935, 50
- 171 Flower 1935, 56
- 172 Greenblatt Ed. 1988, 327 R. Helgerson 'The land Speaks: Cartography, Chorography
and Subversion in Renaissance England'
- 173 Dewar 1964, 157
- 174 Rowse 1972, 28
- 175 DNB 1975
- 176 DNB 1975
- 177 Parliamentary Survey of Theobalds, 1650, PRO E317/Herts/26, f.23.
- 178 Summerson 1959, 124
- 179 Waldstein f.149 Ed. Groos 1981, 83
- 180 Waldstein f.149 Ed. Groos 1981, 83. The 'wildman' image was a popular figure of
the complex progress entertainments, featuring at Kenilworth (1575), Cowdray
(1591) and Bisham (1592) for example (see B. R. Smith 110-112) A plan of the
theatre and steps of S. Germain-en-laye (Thorpe, T167 & 168) dated 1600 is
inscribed "Undr thes steares is an Ile vawlted very faire wth 3 rockes made very
arteficially wth byrds, stones & organs going with water &c" the theatre was
begun by Philibert de l'Orme for Henri II, (Summerson 1966, 89) and this feature
sounds to be very much in the same idiom as the interior grotto at Theobalds
- 181 Rye 1865, 44
- 182 Strype Annals 1824, iii pt 1, 272. Kelly was the charlatan alchemist and
associate of Dee.
- 183 Rye 1865, 44
- 184 Vitruvius BkII Ch 2, ii. Trans. Hicky Morgan 1960, 38
- 185 Vitruvius BkII Ch 2, iii-iv. Trans. Hicky Morgan 1960, 39. For interest in the
subject in the Renaissance see Fermor 1993, 62-63
- 186 Waldstein f.149 Ed. Groos 1981, 83
- 187 Nichols 1836, 152 quoting Vogages celebres et remarquables par le
Sieur Jean Albert de Mandelslo, traduit par Wicquefort, 1640 (Amsterdam 1727)
736- 738

-
- 188 Nichols 1836, 152 quoting Voyages celebres et remarquables par le Sieur Jean Albert de Mandelslo traduit par Wicquefort, 1640 (Amsterdam 1727) 736-738
- 189 Waldstein f.149 Ed. Groos 1981, 83
- 190 Nichols 1836, 154
- 191 Nichols 1836, 152
- 192 The preamble is printed in Nichols 1836, 150. The whole text is remarkably similar to a report in the Times in 1992 on Bocket Hall, only a few miles from Theobalds, as the chosen venue for EEC ministers during Britain's presidency of the Council. Impressive house, close to London, golf shooting, luxury accommodation etc. (The Times 10th June 1992)
- 193 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 33, f.70
- 194 Chambers 1961, Vol i, 16 fn 2, quotes Holinshed iii, 1315 from BL Harleian MSS 293, f.217
- 195 Chambers 1961, Vol i, 16 fn 2
- 196 Gascoigne et. al 1576, printed in Nichols 1823, Vol 1, and Laneham's letter, see Bruce R. Smith 1977, 82-105 & Appendix, 110
- 197 Printed in Yates 1969, 190; Dee's preface to Henry Billingsley's translation of Euclid's Elements published 1570
- 198 Printed in Yates 1969, 191; Dee's preface to Henry Billingsley's translation of Euclid's Elements published 1570
- 199 The section under this heading concentrates on Cecil's involvement with state patronage through the Office of the Royal Works. As a consequence, many of the references have been taken, or derive from references in the History of the King's Works Vols. 3 & 4 1485-1660. A further development of this research would warrant a separate study. Where the references are taken, without further reference, from the King's Works the volume is put at the beginning of the footnote, with source reference afterwards where appropriate. Where I have consulted the original documents, the references for which have been taken from the King's Works, the volume reference comes after that of the original document in the footnote. Cecil's house building is not extensively discussed here as comparisons and contrasts between Burghley and Theobalds, both of the architecture and the building history, occur throughout the thesis. References are also made elsewhere in the text to Cecil House in the Strand. An outline of the scant information available relating to this property is given by Gotch in Barnard Ed. 1904, 52-55. Where relevant new material has come to light, it is also mentioned later in the text of the thesis.
- 200 HMC Salisbury Vol 1, 92-3 ; King's Works IV, 157
- 201 HMC Salisbury Vol I, 92-3; King's Works IV, 157
- 202 SP Dom 12/4/56 & 12/6/25; King's Works III, 319
- 203 E 351/3202, 3203; King's Works III, 319
- 204 RCHM City of York vol. IV. , 31.
- 205 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 6,31; King's Works III, 321
- 206 King's Works III, 321
- 207 E 351/3203; King's Works III, 321
- 208 King's Works IV, 108
- 209 SP Dom 12/43/73
- 210 HMC Salisbury Vol 1, 889
- 211 King's Works III, 72
- 212 King's Works III, 72
- 213 King's Works 111, 73
- 214 King's Works III, 77 E351/3202-5 & 3208

-
- 215 King's Works III, 78
- 216 King's Works III, 77 E 351/3202-5
- 217 King's Works III, 77, Cal Pat Rolls, 1563-6, 85
- 218 See below for examples of Cecil's involvement with military architecture, and also for numerous references of examples of his wider participation in Office of Works affairs.
- 219 For example Chester Castle, King's Works III, 238-9; Fotheringhay, 250-51; Hertford Castle 255-6; Richmond, Greenwich, Waltham, Woking, 77 officers reporting direct to Cecil on work in progress; 1597 the sculptor Cornelius Cure was recommended by Cecil who obviously knew his work as "full of inventions" with a lot of experience abroad, 101, Cam Uni Lib, Ee 3/56/94; Guilford, 1591 where Cecil made with his "own hand" a "rude trick thereof in the manner of a platt" of the Friary, Vol IV 124, Loseley MSS ed. Kempe 1863 304-5, etc. etc.
- 220 King's Works III, 251, E 101/463/23
- 221 Hatfield MSS CP 202/108, 26th May 1573, Peter Kemp to Lord Burghley; HMC Salisbury MSS Vol 2 no 135 June 16th 1573, Peter Kemp to Lord Burghley
- 222 E 101/463/23
- 223 W. Thomas 1542 Ed. Froude 1861, 78
- 224 King's Works IV, 370, 374-6
- 225 King's Works IV 369-70
- 226 Howard 1987, 188
- 227 King's Works IV, 397-99
- 228 Girouard 1983, 29
- 229 King's Works III, 322
- 230 SP Dom 12/105/79
- 231 King's Works III, 325
- 232 King's Works III, 326; MPF 150,254,266. The plans are reproduced full size in St John Hope 1913. These plans and Hawthorn's work for Cecil are discussed in detail in Chapter 6
- 233 The banqueting house was demolished in 1635, but the gallery, which is now the Royal Library, fundamentally follows Hawthorn's plans; King's Works III, 326
- 234 St John Hope 1913, 279. Cecil's involvement at Windsor is discussed more fully in Chapter 6
- 235 See Summerson 1957, 209-216 & 222-225
- 236 Summerson 1957, 211 & 214
- 237 Read 1955, 122, SP Dom 12/1/2
- 238 King's Works IV, 448, Cal SP Dom Addenda 1547-65 p454
- 239 Read 1955, 151
- 240 Read considered Cecil's performance in the negotiations to show all his political abilities, long and short term, at their most effective (Read 1955, 192)
- 241 Read 1955, 38
- 242 Read 1955, 38
- 243 King's Works IV, 373
- 244 Hoby Ed. Powell 1902, 117
- 245 SP Foreign, April 9 1566, quoted in Hoby Ed. Powell 1902, preface xiii- xiv
- 246 There is a plan at Hatfield of Calais indicating possible strategies for a siege
- 247 Cal SP Foreign 1558-1559 no 1246, King's Works IV, 657
- 248 Harvey 1993, 31-32
- 249 Harvey 1993, 37
- 250 HMC Salisbury Series 9 Vol I, 181

-
- 251 Cal SP Scottish 1547-1563, 248
 - 252 Read 1955, 153
 - 253 King's Works III, 651
 - 254 Cal SP Foreign 1558-1559, no 1261
 - 255 Cal SP Foreign 1559-1560 no 635 (SP Foreign 59/2/83) King's Works IV, 651
 - 256 SP Foreign 59/2/83
 - 257 Cal SP Foreign no 718 & HMC Salisbury Series 9 Vol 1,181, King's Works IV, 652
 - 258 King's Works IV, 653
 - 259 King's Works IV, 655 & 402
 - 260 King's Works IV, 402
 - 261 Cal SP Foreign 1561-1562, no 69, 37
 - 262 Cal SP Foreign 1561-1562
 - 263 King's Works IV, 656-7
 - 264 Cal SP Foreign 1564-1565, no 1058
 - 265 Cal SP Foreign 1564-1565, no 1075, King's Works IV, 659
 - 266 Cal SP Foreign 1564-1565, no 1075
 - 267 Cal SP Foreign 1564-1565, no 1075 (SP 59/9/44-46, King's Works IV, 658
 - 268 Examples of Cecil's involvement include Portsmouth 1571, and 1585, King's Works IV, 516, 1587, 524; Dover Harbour 1583. The Dover project, where Thomas Digges was involved, hinged on the damning method to be used and it was Cecil who gave judgement in favour of the Romney Marsh method. (King's Works IV, 759)
 - 269 King's Works IV, 413
 - 270 DNB 1975, Paul Ivey
 - 271 Hatfield MSS P/11448
 - 272 Harvey 1993, 65; Summerson 1957, 204-5
 - 273 Summerson 1957, 207
 - 274 Summerson 1957, 207
 - 275 HMC Series 9 Vol 5, 378; Summerson 1957, 208
 - 276 King's Works IV, 663 Cal Border papers ii, Nos. 936, 993. Cecil was active almost to the end, but by this date the address was probably more of a courtesy than a reality.
 - 277 SP Dom 12/27/151 cited in Beckingsale 1967, 215-216
 - 278 Cal Border Papers ii, Nos. 936,993
 - 279 HMC Salisbury Vol 1, 373. Hunsdon had just been appointed governor in 1569
 - 280 Tytler 1839 Vol 1, 323 (original letter in SP Dom 2 October 1550)

CHAPTER TWO : THE HOUSE OF CECIL 1553-1566: PART 1

By the mid-1550s when building work at Burghley is first recorded, not only had Cecil's future potential for high office been recognised by those at the centre of power, privately he was already a man of considerable property. The highest concentration of land was in the fringes of the counties of Lincolnshire, Rutland and Northamptonshire which surrounded the town of Stamford. His father, Richard Cecil, had ceded all his lands in the first two to William and Mildred following their marriage in 1545¹ and William inherited a further 530 acres and three messuages in the area when his father died in March 1553.²

The Cecil interest in the area of Stamford is first recorded in 1494 when David Sisilt became a freeman of the town.³ William's grandfather migrated from the family home of the 'Sisilts' at Allt-y-Ynys in Walterstone parish on the Welsh borders of Hereford.⁴ John Aubrey wondered at William Cecil's decision to loosen the connection with a family "of great antiquity" by altering the name on the spurious claim to have them derive from the Roman Caecilii, and that he need "not have gone as far as Italy " for venerable ancestry.⁵ David Sisilt's patron, Sir David Philips, became steward of the royal Manor of Collyweston - the post that was subsequently granted to William Cecil by Princess Elizabeth in 1550.⁶ David Sisilt was also to take over some of Philips' offices when he died, and was appointed as Keeper of several woodlands in the area including Cliffe Park.⁷ At over 1,600 acres, about one third of which was wooded, it was the largest bailiwick of the royal Forest of Rockingham and was excellent hunting country. This appointment too was subsequently held by William Cecil and his elder son Thomas.⁸

At court Sisilt became a member of the king's personal retinue as a yeoman of the guard, and when Henry VIII came to the throne in 1508 he rewarded David's services to his father by granting him more lucrative offices in the Stamford area.⁹ In 1532, David Sisilt took over the prestigious but expensive annual office of Sheriff of Northamptonshire

for the remainder of the year's term.¹⁰ The appointment was a clear signal of the all-important transition of the family's status from the yeomanry to the county gentry, the breakthrough of the class barrier which was essential to the development of William Cecil's future dynastic ambitions.¹¹

Between 1526-8 the manor of 'Little Burley' was sold to David's son, Richard, by Thomas Williams and Margaret Chambers,¹² while certain rights over the property that were held over by Sir William Compton together with lands in Old Burghley, Pilsgate and Stamford were also sold "to Ri Cissyll" in 1527.¹³

Burghley House stands in the middle of its park about half a mile to the south east of Stamford (OS TF/049-/061 Fig 2.1). There is no record of the house Richard Cecil built on the site, but he continued to consolidate his holdings and in 1540 bought outright the priory of St Michael's, Stamford Without, and 299 acres of demesne lands that he had first been granted lease of in 1537. The tradition that Burghley stands on the priory site is mistaken, although there must have been a building somewhere - probably a grange - because in 1556 the water supply was being brought to the house from the "freres cundith" some distance away.¹⁴ Richard Cecil was appointed as a Justice of the Peace for Northamptonshire, and Sheriff of Rutland in 1539. His position as Chief Officer of the Robes to Henry VIII was "a place of no great benefit but some respect by reason of his attendance near the person of the prince"¹⁵ and like his father, he was able to make arrangements for the succession to certain of his offices of his son, William.¹⁶

William Cecil brought a sharp commercial instinct to the acquisitive policy of the family. By June 1549, he was wealthy enough in his own right to buy, with Lawrence Eresby, a package of chantry properties in and around Stamford for the considerable sum of £2,129 2s. 7 1/2 d.¹⁷ Cecil was in an good position to know the plum parcels of real estate within this remit, for in February 1548 he had been appointed as one of the surveyors of property due to the king under the terms of the Chantries Act.¹⁸ He was also

appointed as a Sewers Commissioner - an important and influential post in the Fens area . The executive officer, Richard Ogle, reporting to him on the neglected state of the Fens in parts of Lincolnshire, was also advising Cecil on land purchases.¹⁹ In a letter of 18 July 1552, Ogle praised the improvements effected through the active policies of drainage Cecil had advocated,²⁰ and the increased value of improved or reclaimed land no doubt also worked to Cecil's personal advantage.

Following Northumberland's ascent to power in 1550, Cecil was given a substantial package of manors and rectory lands, many of them in the locality. In 1552 he bought the manor of Barholm and the Austin Friary in Stamford.²¹ In 1553 his father died. As well as his inheritance he acquired more Lincolnshire land from the crown for £668.²² By the early 1560s his sizeable portfolio of land-related offices included some twenty appointments in the local area.²³

Cecil maintained his active style of estate management through property dealing throughout his life, often making handsome profits. In May 1559, for instance, he bought the manor and advowson of Lamport from his ward, the Earl of Oxford, for £530. Eight months later he sold it to the Isham brothers for £610.²⁴ This is a significant sum when considered in relation to his income from land rentals, recorded by Cecil to be just over £400 a year at this time.²⁵

In 1561 the queen granted Cecil the manor of Stamford Baron with its profitable commercial interests in the town.²⁶ Stamford was not only surrounded by Cecil lands, a sizeable part of the town itself was now in Cecil ownership. William Cecil may not have been the feudal baron of the town but he had become its principal property baron.

Despite the Cecils' apparently steady progress into the land based economy of the gentry there are hints that the cost of acquisitions and the concomitant cost of providing fitting hospitality and 'port'²⁷ meant austerity behind the facade. David Cecil made urgent

pleas to Thomas Cromwell in 1534 for the Crown to reimburse the costs he had incurred as Sheriff in 1532/3.²⁸ By 1551 William was complaining of dire need and of his "poor lame house" to Bishop Ridley.²⁹ Throughout his life he regularly lamented his poverty-stricken state, of ruining himself for queen and country, and on achieving his title, of being the "poorest Lord in England".³⁰ Much of this rhetoric can be discounted as the protective cloaking he adopted to guard himself from potential suitors, and Ridley quite clearly did not take Cecil's wolf cries very seriously. But real or imagined, Cecil does appear to have suffered from a sense of financial insecurity closely related to his social insecurity, both of which have implications for his approach to the development of Burghley.

It is economic prudence and political advantage that govern the moral - or amoral - tone of the famous Precepts written for his son, Robert Cecil, in the 1580s. The cynical nature of these instructions anticipate Francis Bacon's premise that "those that are first raised to nobility are commonly more virtuous, but less innocent, than their descendants; for there is rarely any rising but by a commixture of good and evil arts."³¹ They draw heavily on Cicero's *de Officiis* - also set out as precepts to son by a 'new' man.³²

Hospitality, Cecil urged, should be fitting to one's estate, "rather plentiful than sparing", "but not too costly, for I never knew any grow poor by keeping an orderly table". The fear that he, or his heirs might "grow poor" was still haunting Cecil in the 1580s. It would after all have annihilated the whole thrust of his ambition to establish a dynasty. Despite the romantic notions surrounding the concept of nobility which Cecil appeared to endorse in his iconographic schemes at both Theobalds and Burghley, his understanding of the reality beneath as he expressed in the precepts was that "gentility is nothing but ancient riches".³³

"Ancient riches" had to be protected and expressed by converting disposable income into entailed family estate. From the start of his building campaign at Burghley, and for the rest of his life, Cecil was to invest a large part of his ever-increasing fortune in his

houses and estates. But it was Burghley that began as, and remained, the most personally significant of them all.³⁴ It was the centrepiece of his dynastic ambition. At the same time it was strategically placed to attract a visit from the monarch, indeed it had already received one from the Duke of Northumberland on his way to Scotland when he was acting as 'quasi-king' in Edward VI's reign.³⁵ Many influential and potentially influential courtiers already had property in the area, including Catherine, Duchess of Suffolk, Sir Edward Griffin, Edward, Lord Clinton, Sir William Compton, Christopher Hatton and Walter Mildmay. Others were to follow. The park surrounding Burghley House was on the very edge of the Great North Road - the main artery from London to Scotland and the North. Burghley was within easy reach of East Anglia where another clutch of courtiers had their country properties, and of its principal city, Norwich, then the second largest city in the kingdom. The royal properties of Grafton, Fotheringhay and Collyweston were close at hand. Above all the hunting, the 'sport of kings' (and queens), in the royal Forest of Rockingham, where Cecil was keeper of Cliffe Park, was second to none in the country.

Gifts to the great, Cecil further advocated in the Precepts, should be substantial and designed to please and be noticed. Without a policy of courting the support of the powerful by such calculations, "in this ambitious age thou mayest remain like a hop without a pole and be made a football for every insulting companion to spurn at".³⁶ Burghley provided a choice site which Cecil could simultaneously build up as a magnificent and alluring offering to the queen, and for his personal dynastic ambition; the ideal combination for a public and a private platform.

The documentary material reveals Cecil's plan for Burghley to have been ambitious in scale from the very beginning of his first building campaign when he introduced stylistic innovations and new planning initiatives. These new concepts were employed to develop rather than to disrupt the continuity of a traditional courtyard plan, but the scope of Cecil's enterprise suggests an intended role for the house over and above that of a locally oriented centre of prestige and hospitality - important though this role was in the schema.

The Building: History and Circumstance

The bulk of the fragmentary documentary evidence for this first phase of Cecil's development of Burghley is contained within one-way correspondence to Cecil from officers on site. Their business occupies the space between the conceptual plans and the reality of the conditions of production: the availability of labour, the supply of materials, the vagaries of the site and the weather, the revision of ideas and the financial constraints. These are constants in the history of the building process, however comprehensive the original planning may have been. They are not necessarily indicative of quaint practices confined to the period before the 'professional' architect takes the lead. In this context it is worth noting, for example, the strong similarity with correspondence from Nicholas Hawksmoor written to Lord Carlisle on 26 May 1701, concerning work at Castle Howard³⁷ and the letters concerning Burghley addressed to Cecil.³⁸

Hawksmoor's preoccupations are with the progress of the work, delays by the weather, minor errors on the part of the workmen, the difficulties of levelling the ground of the site "yr Lp has chose", the need to take on more masons, and the supply of lime and coal for building work. The correspondence from Burghley is equally limited to the microcosm of the site. But in neither case does this give any indication of the overall context, scale and scope of the building design.

What the evidence from the documents immediately concerning the building of Burghley does make clear is that it was Cecil who was the ultimate controller of its detailed execution, and that he was the initiator of the design, together with any designers whom he might have been employing in London. The patron/architect of the project was operating for the most part within a wholly different geographical and cultural environment from that of the building itself. As we have seen, Cecil's context was that of the cosmopolitan society of London and the court. He was working and sometimes living in the lavish surroundings of the palaces on which Henry VIII had spent so freely. His house

in the Strand which he bought in 1560 was on the thoroughfare between the seat of government and court and the commercial and legal centres of the City. It stood almost opposite his former patron's great mansion, Somerset House, described by Summerson as "unquestionably one of the most influential buildings of the English Renaissance".³⁹

For convenience the most important of the letters concerning the physical development of house, garden and estate at Burghley are printed in the appendices. In Appendix A are a series of letters and one account, first transcribed and published by Gotch in 1890. Appendix B consists of transcriptions of hitherto unpublished material. This includes a schedule of items for the freemasons, prepared by Cecil in 1558, and written in his own hand, henceforward referred to as the "Schedule for the Masons" or the "Masons' Schedule". There is also a two-page paper entitled "Memorial" on one page and "Remembrance" on the other (the former has half a page of further items on its reverse side). These lists of general tasks to be attended to at Burghley are also in Cecil's hand. Both sheets are calendared together in the State Papers for 1561, but almost certainly they constitute a running document written as a reminder for himself over a period of time up to 1561. Indeed, they were formerly calendared for 1559. Some of the items on the 'Memorial' page have been crossed through, while others are repeated on both sheets, suggesting they were still live matters. Henceforward, this document is referred to as "the Memorial". A letter to Cecil from John Norris from Burghley 15 May 1556 in the Hatfield papers and extracts from a report by Sir John Abraham complete Appendix B. Quotations from unpublished documents that are cited less frequently are printed only in the text.

The Men

The pattern of communication between Cecil and the site, as far as can be established from the fragmentary evidence, was for his steward to make regular reports on work in progress and day-to-day problems that had not been anticipated in the overall plan. Other officers occasionally corresponded directly with Cecil. Some indication of the

frequency of communication during Cecil's absences can be gauged through a letter from his steward, Peter Kemp, to Cecil of 3 November 1561. Kemp opens: "I have recyved yo^r letters of the 21 & 23 of October".⁴⁰ Kemp's previous surviving letter is dated 18th October. In a period of just over two weeks alone, at least four letters were exchanged. Allowing for the period up to 1558 when Cecil was based at Burghley for some of the time, there must nevertheless have been a huge body of letters while Cecil masterminded the building work down to the last detail, even when he was only occasionally on site.

The earliest documentary evidence for the building work is John Abraham's accounts for the period 27 April 1555 to 29 April 1556 when £90 14s 2d was spent on the work.⁴¹ Cecil's household transferred from Burghley to Wimbledon in October 1555 when he sat for Lincolnshire in Parliament.⁴² By Michelmas of 1556 there were only eleven "household servants" recorded as working at Burghley including a joiner, Hicks, and a mason, Cordall, both of whom seem, therefore, to have been retained on more than a casual basis.⁴³ Sir John Abraham appears to have held a senior position in the overall hierarchy of Cecil's households at Burghley and Wimbledon, for he was the only member of staff to be provided with three sets of livery.⁴⁴ By September of 1555 he already owed Cecil money on lands in St Martin's parish⁴⁵ and he was also a tenant of Cecil at Great Casterton, where he farmed in a small way, for in 1556 he was appealing with several others for Cecil to intervene on their behalf to waive a tithe and save them from having to sell their sheep at a poor price out of season.⁴⁶ There are no communications from him after 1558, although there is a note in the margin of the Memorial "my rental of Wykes to be shown by Abraham to Taprō", so he may have been acting for Cecil in the period up to 1561.⁴⁷

On 15 May 1556 two letters went to Cecil in London, one from Abraham⁴⁸ and one from John Norris.⁴⁹ A month later a letter from the mason, Roger Warde, written directly to Cecil makes it clear Norris was acting as the interpreter of Cecil's intentions on site. Warde wanted details of window designs direct from Cecil because he could not

"understand by Johne nores after what sort yow wolde have them but as I dowe understand by hys talkeyng yow dowe intend to have them after the same molds that the beye wyndow ys mayd by".⁵⁰

The tone of Norris's letter, allowing for the conventions of the period, and that he was trying to excuse himself from a visit to his patron, is more familiar than that of any of the other officers writing from Burghley. By implication he refers to Cecil as a "friend": "...you did licence me and my fellow Wescott to come to your mastership and so to other friends at Whitsuntide next".⁵¹ Like Abraham, Norris is also referred to in the margin of the Memorial where Cecil noted "ye tymber at St Lenards to be viewed by Norr. and p/ed [passed?]"⁵² and "Norris" is mentioned once more in a report by Edmund Hall of 1564.⁵³ A John Norris was also the owner of Holt Manor in Dingley - about eighteen miles from Burghley - which was bought by Sir Edward Griffin, Attorney General to Queen Mary, in 1557 or 1558.⁵⁴ Possibly this was the same John Norris who, nominally at least, held the post of Comptroller of the Works at Windsor from 1538 right up to 1577. He was Gentleman Usher of the Chamber for part of this time, and was not responsible for the everyday tasks of a clerk at the castle.⁵⁵ Northamptonshire was already a fashionable county, and this would be the sort of property one might expect a minor courtier with interests in the area to have owned and sold to a senior courtier who was building up an estate. Such a man would also have been a suitably educated and experienced candidate to act as an overseer and liaison between London and Burghley, as is evident from his letter, for the absentee Cecil. If this was the same man as the Comptroller at Windsor, then from the very inception of his building at Burghley, Cecil was making use of a contact who had experience in the Royal Works, as he was to continue to do in his subsequent building programmes at Theobalds and at Burghley.

Meanwhile, Roger Warde, the mason who wrote on 13 June 1556,⁵⁶ is mentioned again in an endorsement by Cecil on Abraham's report of 22 November 1557.⁵⁷ He was probably the same "Roger Worde" who is recorded on Christmas Eve 1551 in the

account book at Chatsworth when he was paid twenty shillings "for drawing my Mrs platt".⁵⁸ Warde was obviously capable of drawing up plans, for Cecil reminded himself in the Memorial, to "cause Ward to make a platt of my court of husbandry".⁵⁹ Craftsmen inevitably followed work from one major building project to another. Most of the important patrons were acquaintances, if not friends as well as rivals, and a good track record was the best recommendation for anyone looking for work at the prime sites. Indeed, patrons sometimes had to compete for the skills on offer. In 1560 Bess of Hardwick was writing from Chatsworth to Sir John Thynne at Longleat asking to borrow "a connyng plaisterer",⁶⁰ while Thynne, in turn, had had to wait in the queue behind the Duke of Northumberland for the mason John Chapman, who had been working for Sir William Sharington at Lacock in 1553.⁶¹

There are no more references within the Burghley correspondence which allude to Warde, and a new mason of some importance may have been his replacement. In October 1561, the steward, Peter Kemp, informed Cecil that "the name of the mason I wryt to yo of is Thomas Hatcher dwell [sic] at ruskome [Ruscombe] iij myles from Reyding. he promest me he wold serve yo w^towt fayle".⁶² Much later, in 1575, following correspondence with Cecil about administrative difficulties over building work at Windsor Castle (where John Norris was still Comptroller), a list of responsibilities was issued, which included "Thomas Hatche to be in charge of the masons workes for the castle".⁶³ Henry Hawthorn was in charge of hiring masons and might well have taken on a man recommended by Cecil, whose work he might already have known from Burghley, and who originated from Berkshire.⁶⁴

By 1561 Peter Kemp was Cecil's steward, acting in the capacity of estate manager. He seems to have taken on Abraham's role, though as the note on the Memorial suggests, there may have been some overlap between them. In 1560 Kemp was already acting on Cecil's behalf in negotiating the transfer from the Dean and Chapter of Peterborough to Cecil of the manor of Stamford Baron, full rights over which were granted

to Cecil by the queen in 1561.⁶⁵ Like Abraham, he also became one of Cecil's tenant farmers. In 1561 he wrote to Cecil trusting he would be "my good Master for the leas of the farme of Coltneyt"⁶⁶ and a quitclaim by him to Cecil of a messuage in Glaston and Bisbroke in 1564 indicates he had held lands elsewhere on Cecil's estates.⁶⁷ We have some idea of his status from a transaction concerning a wardship and related lands in the Stamford area in the records of the Court of Wards for 1576 where he is referred to as "Peter Kemp, gentleman".⁶⁸ Kemp stayed in Cecil's service almost up to his death in 1578, during which time he exercised considerable power and responsibility on Cecil's behalf in his absence, and acted as Cecil's eyes and ears supplying up-to-date intelligence on all aspects of local as well as estate affairs.

His letters concerning the building suggest a more confident and creative role than either Warde or Abraham had played. However, Cecil was always deferred to and consulted even in his absence, in much the same way as Thynne was at Longleat,⁶⁹ or Nicholas Bacon over the numerous houses that he was responsible for building.⁷⁰ All of these ambitious 'new' men appear nervous of trusting responsibility to subordinates in enterprises that constituted their principal financial investments, "a matter wherein such as are thereunto addicted can hardly keep a measure of expense" as Clapham, Cecil's household biographer, observed.⁷¹ Though Cecil was less aggressive towards his employees than Thynne, the management structure at Burghley was not entirely satisfactory. In the prolonged absences of the patron, there was no professional executive whose sole responsibility was for the building works. Kemp's wider responsibilities for the estate, in particular the financial control, could mean a conflict of interests, and more than once Kemp recommends compromise solutions. "It wold do fayre inogh" is a phrase repeated to justify leaving matters that would be costly to put into effect, where in fact it is evident work should have been undertaken.⁷²

It may have been in response to the limitations of this working organisation that in 1564 Cecil commissioned Edmund Hall, over Kemp's head, to assess the situation at

Burghley. He was a professional local surveyor of some experience. In 1550 he was already working for Cecil's neighbour and close friend, Catherine, Duchess of Suffolk, who wrote to Cecil mentioning that Edmund Hall was helping her with regard to buying Spilbury Chantry for the land that formerly financed its offices.⁷³ Hall reported direct to Cecil on 30 August 1564.⁷⁴

Hall's approach was altogether more professional than Kemp's. It is obvious that Cecil and he had already discussed certain design solutions and Hall's recommendations from on site observations are bolder than Kemp's. Where Kemp had been prevaricating for over a year about levelling the garden on grounds of empirically judged costs,⁷⁵ Hall had no hesitation in recommending that the work must be undertaken to achieve a satisfactory aesthetic result. He reported to Cecil that he had already arranged for a measured sample of the work to be put in hand so that an accurate calculation of the expense could be made. Moreover, he went on to suggest practical means by which the costs could be kept down.⁷⁶

Far more important to the enterprise than any of the men on site was William Cecil himself. During this phase of the building his role appears to be that of chief executive who had in-depth comprehension and ultimate control of every aspect of the building, although he was absent from Burghley for much of the time. From Elizabeth's accession in November 1558, he was back in office, making himself indispensable as "the man who does everything"⁷⁷ at the absolute centre of power and power struggles. Nevertheless, the remarkable extent of Cecil's continued personal involvement under these circumstances which the documents reveal, confirms the importance he attached to the development of Burghley.

Throughout his life and no doubt in response to his huge workload, Cecil made use of lists in his working organisation of everything from complex arguments over affairs of state⁷⁸ to the supply of nails and a wainscot saw at Burghley.⁷⁹ They provided a concise

shorthand means of ordering and recalling his ideas, and thereby contain a rich concentration of valuable information. The addition of new material in the form of the Schedule for the Masons and the Memorial relating to the building work at the house, both in Cecil's own hand, is therefore extremely valuable and allows a more immediate and precise picture of the nature and degree of his control and his extensive design input to be formulated.

During Mary's reign however, Cecil had less cause to be away from Burghley than at any other time in his career. Even so, as the diplomatic missions abroad indicate, he did not lose touch with the administration and its most powerful members, but he still had ample time to plan the building in detail. It is clear from what is omitted from discussion in the subsequent letters, that the overall plan was understood by both parties. Both sides almost certainly had master copies of ground-plans at least, as well as an accumulating body of additional drawings of details, such as those for the windows that Warde was asking to have drawn up in 1556.⁸⁰ In order for Cecil to control the operation remotely, plans must have played a key role in the system of communication between himself and the site. In 1561, for instance, he appears to have spotted a design fault in the proposed layout of the court of husbandry from a rudimentary plan sent to him by Kemp the previous week.⁸¹

A plan for both the court of husbandry, and for the orchard were on his list in the Memorial. One can safely assume that if these less important areas warranted drawn plans, then more professional drawings for the "capital" house must have existed. The surviving plans and drawings relating to Theobalds give some indication of the extent and manner in which Cecil made use of them in the architectural process. Annotations, mostly in his own hand and sometimes signalling only fairly minor alterations show that not only the ground-plan and the principal elements of design, but also quite detailed refinements were worked out conceptually. A plan might be rejected - denoted by Cecil's annotation "voyd" on several plans - before the final form was decided upon and presumably before the particular

stage of the building process in question began.⁸² One can reasonably assume that similar practices were adopted at Burghley. Remarks made by Sir Ralph Sadler following his visit to Burghley in August 1559, suggest that the end-plan of the first building campaign was well understood by those in charge on site. Sadler wrote encouragingly to Cecil informing him that "Your man [probably Abraham or Norris] promised to tell you I was at your house as I posted by. I like what is done and the order of the rest as your man showed it cannot but be fair.... I wish you go on with speed, for the sooner it is finished the more pleasure and commodity you shall have".⁸³ Sadler was an experienced and wealthy architectural patron who built on a lavish scale at his home at Standon during Henry VIII's reign, and his favourable comments support the evidence that the concept of Cecil's first undertaking at Burghley was on an ambitious scale.

The House

None of these working plans is known to have survived. The earliest plans we have of the ground and first floors of Burghley House are those in John Thorpe's book of drawings, now at the Sir John Soane Museum. In June 1606 a warrant was issued for payment to John Thorpe, on behalf of the King's Works, for "drawing down and writeing fair plattes of Holdenby, Ampthill and Burghley".⁸⁴ Ampthill was by this time a royal property and Holdenby was to become one in 1607, and Thorpe is recorded as having been commissioned to survey Ampthill in 1605.⁸⁵ There are no other known plans of Burghley by Thorpe and there seems no reason to doubt that the plans in Thorpe's book are the "fair plattes" of the house referred to in the warrant, in which case they were part of an important formal commission, based on Thorpe's own surveys, and one can expect them to be reliable within the limits of the techniques of the period (Plans F1 & F2).

There are some discrepancies of dimension on the plans when compared with the existing fabric of the house and its ground-plan (Plan F3). The courtyard for instance (allowing for Gandy Deering's corridors added in 1828-33) is represented by Thorpe as

approximately 8 ft (2.4 m) shorter east to west than in the actual building and more regularly disposed (See Plan 11 for comparison). There is an even greater shrinkage of approximately 12ft (3.65m) north to south in the area between the great hall and the kitchen (T/012 & T/002). These anomalies can reasonably be accounted for by mistakes and omissions made in a survey of such size and complexity. Specific details, however, appear to have been accurately recorded. Where independent evidence has come to light, it has tended to corroborate Thorpe's plans.⁸⁶ For example, in 1989 plasterwork at the west end of Gandy Deering's south corridor (042) was removed to allow for conservation work and the suppressed architecture of what had been the exterior wall behind it, showing former door and window openings, was exposed. The wall was surveyed and compared with Thorpe's plans of the ground and first floors, and in the opinion of the honorary architect to Burghley at the time, Alan Wilson, provided "interesting support for the basic accuracy of Thorpe."⁸⁷ A number of similar examples where this has proved to be the case are cited in the thesis, and in general Thorpe is taken to be reasonably reliable in the extensive references that are inevitably made to his plans.⁸⁸

From what can be inferred from the documents, Cecil's intention in this first building phase at Burghley appears to have been to incorporate the main structures of his father's house, but to develop the building into a substantial and luxurious courtyard mansion that was organized on more unified and symmetrical principles. Internally, features such as a gallery designated for Mildred Cecil and a well-appointed lodging block integrated into the main body of the house suggest new standards of luxury and a new perception of the country house as a social hospitality centre. Some radical new features of classical or French-inspired Renaissance architecture were introduced, most importantly for this date an outward-looking loggia with a full entablature, and possibly a second courtyard loggia imported ready-made from Flanders.

From the beginning of his building activities it becomes apparent that Cecil intended to introduce innovative architectural features at Burghley. Roger Warde's letter of 13 June

1556 discloses that this experienced mason was nevertheless wholly unfamiliar with the "lucan" type of window which Cecil was proposing, and was extremely anxious to have precise measured drawings of every detail directly from his employer.⁸⁹ In order that absolutely no mistakes in the interpretation of his patron's meaning could be made he was not prepared to trust to a middle-man. Cecil was urged to "drawe yowre menyng" that Warde might "understande youre mynde".⁹⁰

The installation of "lucan" windows, from the French "lucarne" or dormer, implies that there were pitched roofs, rather than flat leads, at this stage. There is no antique precedent for dormers or the steeply raked roofs that are such a distinctive feature of French and Flemish Renaissance architecture. These are fitting only for colder, wetter climates than those predominating in Greece and Italy. Serlio acknowledged the practical advantages of what he recognised as a particular "French" style of steeply pitched roofs with dormers which could contain a number of storeys,⁹¹ and they feature in the majority of the buildings illustrated in his treatises, as they do in those of du Cerceau and de l'Orme.

Like Cecil in 1556, Thynne had already been installing "lucan" windows at Longleat in 1554.⁹² But in English sixteenth-century architecture the use of dormer windows as a prominent design feature, in the manner that Thomas Gresham was to employ at the Royal Exchange (1565), was a less usual innovation than the more conventional pattern of multi-gabled roof lines with windows set into the wider wall-face, in the manner of Grimsthorpe Castle, the Lincolnshire house of Catherine, Duchess of Suffolk, for example. (Figs. 2.2 & 2.3)

The use of dormer windows in the French manner seems to have been an arrangement favoured by the Somerset circle and their Elizabethan followers. Sharington's upper gallery at Lacock was lit on both sides by small dormers with classical trimmings, still evident in the main courtyard roof, and there are more substantial but plainer ones in the service court (Fig. 2.4). As well as Gresham and Thynne, Thomas Smith, who had an

extensive first-hand knowledge of French architecture, was to take up the feature at Hill Hall sometime after 1569.⁹³

Undoubtedly, the pitched roofs at Burghley would have been of Collyweston slates, the standard quality roofing material in the area since Roman times, mined from the lands of the nearby royal manor of which Cecil held the stewardship. Collywestons are still in place over the great hall width of the east range, and one of the items in Cecil's Memorial is to "send for a slaytor".⁹⁴ Collywestons require a pitch of not less than 45°, ⁹⁵ so one would expect to find accommodation within the resulting deep roof space and, if organised with dormers as outlined, then closer to French practice than the traditional English style.

There are even clearer signs that Cecil was introducing French-inspired architecture at Burghley in the Schedule for the Masons that he drew up in 1558, where he uses the very term "French" several times to indicate a particular type of window. The Schedule specifies new windows to match existing ones, and all, with one exception, to be of three lights.⁹⁶ As the thrust, therefore, was towards uniformity, this presumably included the design of those that Warde had been concerned with in June 1556, of which the mouldings in turn were to match those of a bay window.⁹⁷ By November 1557 Abraham had reported that the masons at Cliffe Park - where Cecil, as Keeper held the quarrying rights - had "wrought up" all the windows and would be finished by Christmas.⁹⁸

The references to "French" windows are all for windows in gables for a second-floor gallery. The "lucan" style of window that Warde was patently so unfamiliar with in 1556, seems the most likely explanation of what Cecil meant by the use of the term "French window" in England at this time.⁹⁹ Just such three-light windows, dominating the design of the gable-ends, rather than simply set into them, are shown on the drawing by John Thorpe which is probably a copy of an earlier drawing relating to Theobalds (Fig. 2.5).¹⁰⁰ If this is the case, then these windows were similarly to light a long gallery, as

they were at Lacock.¹⁰¹ At Thomas Smith's Hill Hall a two-light dormer in the courtyard was contained within a Corinthian aedicule, while the plainer dormers on the south external front,¹⁰² probably always had three lights like those specified for Burghley. (Fig.2.6)

In 1558 the only known printed source of illustrations of French domestic architecture was a set of engravings by Jacques Androuet du Cerceau copyrighted, but not published, in 1545.¹⁰³ Serlio's book of domestic architecture may have been circulating in manuscript form but was not published until 1575, and du Cerceau's Livres d'architecture was only published in 1559. Over the next thirty years du Cerceau's 1545 unpublished prints appear to have circulated widely in Europe and, for example, possibly provided the plan-source for Wollaton Hall.¹⁰⁴ In the knowledge of Cecil's eagerness to obtain the latest architectural information from Europe, already evident by the early 1560s,¹⁰⁵ it is certainly very possible that he might have seen a portfolio of these prints while he was in Europe, or collected a set through one of his contacts, such as Smith (Fig. 2.7). Cecil must have been familiar with some such source because by 1558 he seems to have expected the masons to understand his meaning of the term French window, and the most plausible explanation is that detailed measured drawings, of the sort Warde was calling for in 1556, became the pattern whereby Cecil introduced the most up-to-date French inspired architecture to the local freemasons.

There is no documentary evidence that Cecil employed French or other foreign craftsmen on site at Burghley. There was, however, a thriving local tradition of freemasonry centred around the numerous quarries that had been yielding first class building stone in Northamptonshire for centuries. Cliffe Park, where Cecil's masons were working on the stone windows in 1557, surrounded the small town of Kingscliffe, home of the Thorpe family of masons. Thomas (father of John Thorpe who was to make the plans of Burghley) must already have been in the trade at the time, because his father left him his mason's tools in 1558.¹⁰⁶ Thomas was almost certainly the man principally

responsible for executing the very high quality work at Kirby Hall for Sir Humphrey Stafford between 1570-75, where knowledge of contemporary French architecture is so apparent (Fig.2.8). Furthermore, as Summerson observes, "Many things about the design of Kirby suggest that it originated in the Burghley circle",¹⁰⁷ and though there is no mention of Thorpe by name at Burghley, there must be a strong possibility that he would have been amongst the circle of masons producing work there in the late 1550s.

A further intimation that Cecil may have been introducing his craftsmen to some of the most fashionable work going on at this period comes in a letter from Philip Hoby sent on 2 January 1556/57 informing Cecil that, "your man has been here to view and understand my [m?] work" but because it was not "in sufficient forwardness" Hoby advised he should return in a few weeks.¹⁰⁸ Cecil was a frequent visitor to Hoby's house, Bisham Abbey, near Maidenhead and had been instrumental in effecting the grant of the property to Philip Hoby by Edward VI in 1552.¹⁰⁹ The fabric of the house remains essentially that dating from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, but the alterations made by the Hobys are in the vein of the Somerset circle. The hall fireplace is dated by Long c.1556, just when Cecil's "man" was at Bisham, and described as follows:

"Carved with fine Italianate arabesques and demi-figures above Corinthian columns [it] looks like an example of the Renaissance decoration with direct Italian inspiration, being executed by a mason named Chapman under the influence of Sir Thomas Sharrington at Lacock and the houses of the ruling faction during Edward VI's short reign."¹¹⁰ (Fig. 2.9)

This style is now generally accepted to be inspired more directly by French than Italian models, and is similar in style to such work as Thomas Mason's tomb in Winchester Cathedral, and the fireplace at Broughton Castle erected c.1554, which demonstrate a strong French influence, with certain features found at Fontainebleau and in work by Goujon and his followers (Fig. 2.10).¹¹¹

Following his brother's death in 1558, Thomas Hoby, whose keen interest in European architecture has already been touched upon, continued work at Bisham. Thomas and Philip Hoby's tomb, erected at Bisham by Thomas's widow, Elizabeth Hoby, after her husband's death in Paris in 1566, has also been identified as an example of a continuing thread of the French-inspired style being maintained in England, as has the building work she subsequently undertook on the house at Bisham.¹¹² The marriage of Mildred Cecil's sister and Thomas Hoby on 27 June 1558 provides a cross-reference back to Burghley.¹¹³ Hoby's proposal was only made at the end of May which helps to date the Masons' Schedule more precisely to June at the earliest, as it includes a reference to "My brother Hoby's chamber" in readiness for their prolonged visit to Burghley for the Summer.¹¹⁴

The West Range

The first heading on the Masons' Schedule is for "windows requisite for my new building in the front". As one might expect this "front" range refers to the west entrance range, as becomes clear from the orientation of the various windows detailed. The approach to the house from the west was most probably already established by Cecil's father's buildings. The house was preceded by a base court with a terrace with stone steps which is first referred to in Warde's letter of 1556.¹¹⁵ Cecil planted an orchard to the south of this and on the northern side he inherited a group of farm buildings which he was developing into the "court of husbandry" in the 1560s. A plan of these buildings, enclosed with Kemp's letter to Cecil of 18 October 1561, shows compass points, with the base court marked on the south side, with a terrace in turn on the east side of the base court.¹¹⁶ (Plan 12)

Returning to the Mason's Schedule, in the first bracket for the "front" (west) range Cecil lists a window of three lights in the "nether" (lower) building to agree with a similar window for "my uncle Davydes inner chamber".¹¹⁷ A third three-light window is

specified for another "same" lodging "towards ye orchard", so at the southern end of the range. (See Plans F7 & 13)

In the next bracket comes a window for the first-floor level of the same lodgings. This again is to be of three lights, and to accord with that of the pallet chamber and with "my bro. hobbyes chamb^", and also with two more windows in the same lodging block towards the south, "lyke ye other Gallery wyndows". The position of this gallery in an upper, third storey is confirmed in the next bracket where it is described as "above in the gallery of ye same lodgings". This gallery was to have two windows - the word "fre~ch" has been inserted above and then crossed through - and these windows faced east and were to be square like "that of the north west gable". It was also to have two "other french wyndows of like sorte of iij lights a piece in ye south gable of ye same place over ye lodgings under neath".

From a further French window of two lights specified for a gallery in this range we learn there was a "gilt chamber" beneath it. Cecil also refers to this in the Memorial under the list for the carpenters, where he notes, "a new stair for ye gilt chamber".¹¹⁸ As it was directly below the gallery, it must have been on the first floor and, as its name implies, a fairly high status area warranting its own stair. The gallery above was, presumably, one end of the gallery described as lying above the two storeys of lodgings that faced south towards the orchard.

On the ground floor, therefore, there were suites of lodgings, with another suite stacked above them in the south end of the range on the first floor. The gilt chamber must have been in the north end of the first floor. Above, on the second floor was a gallery, that, from the variety of its window orientations, must have been a long gallery occupying the whole floor. This further suggests that the west was a single width range, although it was of sufficient width to have two south facing three-light windows side by side. If the "french" windows implied dormer windows, then the gallery must have been housed

within the roof space. Warde in his letter of 1556 asked for "a tryke of the uprytght for youre lucan wyndowe and the gabylle end over hytt" so the fact that the "french" windows on the Schedule are detailed to be placed in gables would suggest they refer to the same type.¹¹⁹

All the windows specified bar one were to be of three lights and to accord or agree with one another. Cecil was later to express admiration of Holdenby where "every part [is] answerable to other, to allure liking,"¹²⁰ and a movement towards ordering buildings in this way, so that the matrix of the design is formed by the architectural elements themselves, rather than merely by applied ornament, is acknowledged as the most important development that distinguishes the approach to classical architecture of Somerset and his circle from that of their immediate predecessors in England.¹²¹ By contrast, as Nicholas Cooper's recent findings at Sutton Place have revealed, the house built in the 1520s and previously thought to be a precocious example of such ordering, did not after all have a symmetrical courtyard front before the fire of 1561, or even in the re-construction following.¹²²

A letter from Nicholas Bacon, written to Cecil in 1560, gives some intimation of the priority Cecil put on the external appearance of his buildings at this stage of his architectural development. Bacon criticised new building work at Cecil's London house on the grounds that he had sited a privy "to nere ye logyng to nere an hoven and too nere a lytle lardre, I think you had been better to have offended yor yey[eye] outwrds then yor nose inward".¹²³ Bacon's views of commodity before beauty anticipate those of his son Francis.¹²⁴ Nor was the remark about Cecil's house a trivial criticism in the sixteenth century, when it was widely held that bad "air" was associated not only with disease but that it also signified moral decay and corruption, charges to which Cecil was acutely sensitive. The presence of foul air was characterized by Boorde as "evil" and life-threatening, nothing apart from poison "doth corrupt the blode of man, and also doth mortyfye the spyrytes of man, as doth a corrupt and a contagious ayre".¹²⁵ Claudius'

guilt over the murder of Hamlet's father manifests itself in his imagination by its odour ,
 "O! my offence is rank, it smells to heaven;/ It hath the primal eldest curse upon't;/ A
 brother's murder!".¹²⁶ While Spenser uses the powerful metaphor of pollution to convey
 the defilement of poetry by the base-born when, bereft of the patronage of Prince and
 Priest, it was "prophaned" "Of the base vulgar, that with hands unclean/ Dares to pollute
 her hidden mysterie."¹²⁷

While Cecil was concerned with the outward appearance at Burghley, here he seems
 to have been equally intent on providing the comforts within. He was obviously intending
 to upgrade the standard as well as the appearance of the west lodgings range. In the
 Mason's Schedule he includes "mantill and parrell" [the uprights for chimneypieces] for
 "ye nether now [or new] lodging", and another for the upper suite which was to have a
 chimney or "tonnel" made for it in the south gable.¹²⁸

Under work for the rough masons in the Memorial Cecil also notes "to begin the
 chimneys [fireplaces] in ye new lodgings".¹²⁹ Materials for this work may also have
 included the items imported from Antwerp, for which Cecil owed money to John Mounte
 and Thomas Gresham in December 1561;¹³⁰

16 little pillars of marbill for the gallery -	£16
9 harthes for chemnies at 24s 4d -	£10 10s
6 cheries [chairs] of velvet at £3 the piece -	£18
6 cheries of leather at 23s 4d -	£17 [sic]
one klok -	£5 8s 1d
3 great barrels of nails at £6 13s 4d -	£20 -
one ton of iron -	£9
10 plattes for canndelles -	23s 4d
5 cases of glass at £3 -	£15

Some of the goods had been dispatched in July 1561 and Gresham wrote to Cecil on 1st August that "your pillars of marbell be aryved in safetie".¹³¹ Burgon states that these are items for the building of Burghley House,¹³² and Hussey agrees.¹³³ There is no mention of Burghley on the document itself, and it is possible that these could have been destined for Cecil's newly acquired house in the Strand. However, as a number of items on the list can be related to work going on at Burghley, and as the building campaign there was in full swing, the supposition is most probably correct. "Harthes" usually referred to the actual hearth floors and, as they were being imported, they were probably decorative, rather than purely utilitarian stones, which could have been quarried locally. Hearths installed in lodgings at the royal house of Woking in 1534, for example, were paved with imported "Portiyngeale [Portugal] tyle".¹³⁴ Numerous decorative "foote paces" of coloured marble, polished stone, and painted stone are detailed in the Parliamentary Survey of Theobalds of 1650.¹³⁵ Baron Waldstein noted that there were "unrivalled fireplaces" there in 1600, so they were obviously treated as important decorative as well as functional items by Cecil.¹³⁶

By 1561 word was out in Europe that lucrative contracts from Cecil might be on offer. In May one Florence Diaceto, having heard Cecil was building in the country and in London, made a bid for work directly to Cecil from Paris offering exotic marbles recently discovered in the Pyrenees, which he claimed to be as good as those of Rome and "as used by the King and queen and the nobility". Cecil was sent an engraved and enamelled clock as a 'free gift' and Diaceto proposed that "if Cecil should desire any of it [marble] for chimney pieces, door or windows on looking at the sketches he has sent to Mr. Killegrew, he will obtain it very cheaply".¹³⁷

As well as setting up the fireplaces, "nayles" are on Cecil's list of requirements in the Memorial, as is also "to send for a glasier", so he was obviously ready to take delivery of glass. Apart from the gallery over the west lodging range, in the Memorial there is mention of a doorway to "my wifes gallery", and by 1562 there was a pillared open gallery

on the ground floor of the south range,¹³⁸ so "little" marble pillars for a gallery, probably for a balustrade, would not have been out of place in the architectural scheme Cecil was introducing at Burghley by the early 1560s. Marble had to be imported and the practice of buying it pre-fabricated was obviously cheaper than paying for carriage of uncut blocks. Indeed in Edward's reign, Cecil's former patron, Somerset, paid £41 5s 0d for "marble pyllers bought in Fflanders"¹³⁹ intended for the fitting out of Somerset House. The architectural items from Flanders were probably imported by Cecil for economic reasons as much as for quality of design and manufacture, and not necessarily because craftsmanship of a similar standard was unavailable in England.¹⁴⁰

If the chimneypieces were being installed in 1561, and the lodgings were perhaps ready to be appointed with the continental furnishings Cecil had ordered, in keeping with the new standards of comfort and style that he was introducing, then the work in the west range must have been nearing completion by this date, and there is no further mention of it in the surviving correspondence relating to the first building phase.

Alberti recommended that "Strangers and Guests should be lodged in Chambers near the Vestibule or Fore-gate" and that there should be fitting reception rooms provided for them.¹⁴¹ In England, however, the concept of rationalized high status accommodation ranges, with well-appointed ground-floor and first-floor suites permanently reserved for visiting guests, and major reception rooms above, does not seem to have been wholeheartedly taken up even by the builders of the largest private English houses until well into the seventeenth century.¹⁴² Yet this is what Cecil appears to have been moving towards at Burghley by the early 1560s. It suggests a new attitude to the function of the country house being adopted by Cecil as a vehicle for entertaining and accommodating visiting peer groups like the Hobys, not on the basis of separate or improvised provision of lodgings which could be dressed up for the occasion, but conceived as a permanent element of the fundamental plan. It was a concept that was to be sustained through the second building phase at Burghley.¹⁴³

Site of the West Range, the Cellars, and the South Range

The next question to be addressed is the precise position of the west lodging range relative to the plan of the present house. During conservation work in the 1980s, a cellar shaft was discovered under the floor of the 'Blue and Silver Bedroom' (026, marked 'A' on Plan 3a, cf. Plan F1) in the west range, leading to a small chamber below the west corridor that is part of Gandy Deering's work of the late 1820s (044).¹⁴⁴ This lies to the east of the west range (as Thorpe shows it), under the northern side of the open loggia at the west end of the courtyard (T/051). As Summerson observed in his reconstruction of Theobalds, it is very unlikely that one should find a cellar where there has never been an above-ground building.¹⁴⁵ From the position of the opening shaft in the west range, which is well within the room space of 026, it is clear that this does not make sense as an access point from the present interior ground floor, the ground-plan of which has not been significantly altered since Thorpe's survey was made in 1605/6 (T/026). Its position suggests, therefore, that this was an access, leading from what was open ground, to a cellar beneath an earlier west range that lay immediately to the east of the present range. The shaft is lined with well-dressed ashlar and would have presented a suitable appearance as an entry opening into the terrace of the west base court that fronted the west range, which is shown on the plan of "the court of husbandry" (Plan 12). Furthermore, it would have been in a convenient position to take in supplies from this service area which lay immediately to the north-west of the range. This hypothesis is further supported by the fact that the existing south and north range cellars both terminate to the east of the west range as shown by Thorpe. These cellars give the most likely indication of the eastern-most limit of the early phase building. (The position of the end walls of the south and north cellars are marked 'B' & 'C' on Plan 3a)

There is no surviving evidence that these north and south cellars were connected to a west cellar. There may, however, have been no reason for such a link. This has recently been discovered to have been the case at Wollaton Hall, for example, where the only

connection between the sixteenth-century cellars under one side of the house, which contained accommodation, and the other, which housed domestic offices, was above ground.¹⁴⁶ The cellars under the lodging range at Burghley may similarly have had a distinct function from those of the lateral ranges. Part of a stairway that survives at the western end of the cellars under the north range, rises southwards and would have opened into the north-west stair tower at ground level (as shown on Thorpe T/029), and could have provided a communication route from the north service cellars to a range extending southwards from the stair-tower. (Marked 'D' on Plans 3a & 23).

Meanwhile, the cellars running beneath the south range suggest that the ground-floor arrangement shown by Thorpe in this case was, or approximated to, the earliest built form of Cecil's building on this side of the house, unless an earlier building was entirely demolished (Plan 3a). In the existing cellar a spine wall runs east to west from under the east side of the loggia section as shown on Thorpe, to the west terminating wall, approximately 11 ft (3.35 m) from its north wall. This would conform with the thin partition wall shown above ground on this line on Thorpe's ground-floor plan. The cellar wall has several chambers opening from it to the south, extending to the width of the south build-line where, in the central section, the pillars of the loggia, as shown on Thorpe's ground-floor plan, would have originally stood (T/052) (see Plan 3a). These chambers go down to bedrock and have stepped entrances hewn out of the stone which indicate that seams of the lower Lincolnshire limestone on which the house is sited have been quarried from these areas (used, most probably, as rubble infill in the building work above).¹⁴⁷ The floor levels vary, but in two of the chambers (those under the loggia section) it is only some 3 ft (1m) below the ceiling vault and would have been extremely difficult to excavate once work above ground was in existence.

The South Range

The question therefore arises as to when this south range, under which these cellars lie, was first built? The second part of the Mason's Schedule of 1558 specifies windows

for "my othr ra^ge uppo^ my garde^[garden]". It is clear from the correspondence that the principal gardens were laid out on the south side of the house, so the schedule must refer to the south range (see Plan F7).¹⁴⁸ As one might expect with this prospect, the range contained the great chamber which was to have a bay window at one end and a three-light window at its "nether" or lower end. The stair was similarly to have a three-light window, so quite an important feature, again as would be appropriate for the stairs to a great chamber. Three-light windows were also specified for the bedchamber and a pallet chamber (which was next to the privies). The chapel was to have a "high" window which suggests it may have been an east-facing window. Apart from the chapel and the bay, which may have been a special feature, Cecil was therefore proposing a consistent scheme of fenestration throughout both the west and south ranges.

By the time this work was completed, the south range would have contained at least the foundation of a state suite suitable for accommodating the queen, with bedchamber, closet and garderober (i.e. pallet chamber and privies) probably leading off the great chamber on its west side, assuming that the chapel lay at its other end, facing east. There is no mention, as there is in the west range, of rooms over one another. The great chamber was invariably on the first floor and it is reasonable to assume, therefore, that all these rooms were in this storey. The disposition is supported by information concerning the ground floor.

In Kemp's letter to Cecil of 8 May 1562, referring to the gardens to the south of the house, he recommends that the ground level in the garden be lowered by 2 ft 6 ins

" . .. or else yo^r open galary wyll doe ÿo lytle plesuer for at the present ÿo can skase standing wthin loke into the garden over the soyle of the bay wyndow it may be wyll suffred to syncke where the frese co^rnishe & arcatrave dothe.." ¹⁴⁹

Cecil was obviously alarmed by the visual implications of this proposal, for Kemp wrote again on 16th May reassuring him that "for the falling of the grond table it is not ment otherwyse then those too plases where the pillers do stand the bay wyndow to be as it is w^c is 4 fote to the leyning plac".¹⁵⁰ One can infer from this that the loggia must already have been completed. Work on the south gardens was underway in October 1561,¹⁵¹ and it seems that the unanticipated problem of its level in relationship to the open gallery was apparent by May of the following year.

If the windows on the schedule were all for the rooms on the first floor this would agree with the ground floor being much as it is shown on Thorpe's plan where the whole of the central section of the range on the ground floor is occupied by the loggia on the south, and by partitioned areas, which were obviously not important rooms, facing onto the courtyard. Thorpe's plan shows a two-bay belvedere in the centre of the loggia facing south, which has three bays on either side, divided by columns on square bases, uniform with those which divide and stand on either side of the central projection. (Plan F1).

The bay is not shown as glazed on Thorpe's plan, but very fine lines have been drawn between its square-based columns suggesting that there may have been a query by the surveyor as to the nature of the structure at this point.¹⁵² A drawing endorsed by Cecil "upright of the gallery garden" at Theobalds shows a glazed bay window at its centre, but Cecil has made a note on the drawing that the ground floor window is not to be glazed (Fig. 2.11).¹⁵³ Bay windows with full entablatures are, of course, one of the most striking features shown on Thorpe's drawing of the Strand front of Somerset House where the bays are similarly divided by a central column or pilaster as he shows on the Burghley plan (Fig. 2.12), and this last feature also appears at Ecouen and in du Cerceau's 1545 illustrations (Fig. 2.13).¹⁵⁴ Kemp's description of the "frese cornishe and architrave" sinking between the bay window and the rest of the loggia furthermore indicates that the entablature was not confined to this central feature and must have extended across the whole front of the loggia. Altogether, the correspondence from Kemp of 1562 certainly

suggests that the loggia, "your open gallery", was much as shown by Thorpe. Furthermore, the bay window specified for the great chamber in the Mason's Schedule could refer to the upper part of the central south pavilion, as shown by Thorpe above the loggia bay.

There is no indication in the documents of what might have previously existed on the southern side of the courtyard of Cecil's father's house,¹⁵⁵ but if the west entrance range was complete c.1561 and the south loggia by 1562, almost certainly the ground and first floors of the main part of Cecil's south range were built c.1561-1564.

The bay feature with classical orders was to be adopted most comprehensively at Longleat in the re-building after the fire, but not it seems until 1572 at the earliest.¹⁵⁶ There is no indication of bays of this nature at Longleat by 1562, although in the contract drawn up in 1559 the great gallery window was to have "Colompnes".¹⁵⁷ It is also interesting to find that Kemp, who was not an architectural specialist, nevertheless seems quite familiar with the correct language of classical architecture. The letter was written in the year before John Shute's The First and Chief Grounds of Architecture was published in 1563, the first explanation of the classical orders to appear in English, and is perhaps a further indication of Cecil having introduced those on site to 'new' classical architectural forms from the very beginning of the building work.

A fully-fledged classical loggia is a very significant development in English architecture at this date. Loggias in the new classical Renaissance style were to become a standard feature of courtyard houses from the mid-1560s in England.¹⁵⁸ The existence of one at Burghley by 1562, however, once more seems to indicate that Cecil was taking an architectural lead at his house, this time taking forward a form originally adopted by his other patron during Edward VI's reign, John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, the man who had commissioned Shute to research his treatise. The work at Dudley Castle included a raised colonnade, connecting the range at one end of the great hall with that at the other,

which also served as a covered way from the centrally placed external entrance stair to the screens passage which was off-centre, at the end of the hall. The now ruined colonnade was of the Ionic order with surviving engaged columns butting onto the adjoining walls at either end.¹⁵⁹ The structure most probably had a timber roof. The remaining column closely resembles the single surviving classical column of the sixteenth-century colonnade in the service courtyard at Lacock which may similarly have been intended to support a wooden gallery or bridge (Fig.2.14).¹⁶⁰ Whitehall Palace also had an open wooden "antique" gallery built about 1540¹⁶¹ surrounding the preaching place, familiar from the illustration in John Foxe's Acts and Monuments published in 1563, which would of course have been a well known forum to Cecil (Fig.2.15).¹⁶² But while these were all features supported by classical columns, they were not integral elements of the main body of the architecture to which they were attached. They were add-on or independent structures. At Burghley the loggia was beneath fully walled accommodation and was part of the architecture of the ground floor of a homogeneous range. Like the west lodging range it was a cohesive part of the architectural unit of the house.

Vitruvius gives detailed accounts of loggia-style structures and describes how the colonnades surrounding the palaestra should be divided into "roomy recesses furnished with seats, where philosophers, rhetoricians, and others who delight in learning may sit and converse".¹⁶³ Cicero ran his summer school from the loggia in the grounds of his villa at Tusculanum.¹⁶⁴ The central belvedere and flanking colonnades at Burghley would have provided a very similar architectural environment for social intercourse, at least in the summer months when a visit from monarch and court would be expected. Pliny, likewise, gives enthusiastic accounts of the pleasures of an open arcade overlooking the garden and landscape.¹⁶⁵ Cecil, who was thoroughly familiar with all Cicero's writing and had copies of Pliny's works, and almost certainly at least one copy of Vitruvius, was as likely to have taken architectural inspiration directly from these classical sources as from contemporary built precedents or Renaissance architectural theses which relied heavily on Vitruvius.¹⁶⁶

The only other known example of a masonry arcade, built as part of the main body of the building which introduces some classical elements at a similar date to that at Burghley, is the south courtyard front at Dingley Hall, Northamptonshire, less than twenty miles from Burghley. Cecil was acquainted with its owner, Sir Edward Griffin,¹⁶⁷ and as already mentioned, Norris may have had connections with the property; Cecil might have been following Griffin's lead. The well-known inscription 'God Save the King 1560' over the entrance arch (now blocked) which opened into one end of the courtyard loggia indicates this could have been the case. Nevertheless, the symmetry of the arrangement at Burghley as shown on Thorpe and the manner in which the loggia was integrated into the overall plan shows a far more sophisticated understanding of the form than is evident at Dingley. There, as well as the main entrance arch opening asymmetrically into one side of the loggia, the whole handling of classical forms is treated more as applied architecture rather than as integrated part of the structure (Fig.2.16).

The other major courtyard houses of the 1560s and 1570s which feature loggias, all of which post-date the completed 1562 loggia at Burghley, are as follows (*earliest possible building dates for loggias given) :-

Theobalds	Sir William Cecil	1564
Copt Hall	Sir Thomas Heneage	1564
Gidea Hall	Sir Anthony Cooke	1564
Chatsworth House	Earl & Countess of Shrewsbury	1568
Hill Hall	Sir Thomas Smith	1569
Gorhambury House	Sir Nicholas Bacon	1563 (loggia 1572)
Kirby Hall	Sir Humphrey Stafford	1570
Holdenby	Sir Christopher Hatton	1570
Castle Ashby	Henry, 1st Baron Compton	c. 1574 ¹⁶⁸
Penshurst Place	Sir Henry Sidney	1579 (on the rainwater heads)
Slaugham Place	Richard Covert or Sir Walter Covert	1575(?), 1590(?)

The first six houses, apart from Chatsworth, are within twenty miles of Theobalds; Kirby, Holdenby and Castle Ashby within 20 miles of Burghley. With the exception of Slaugham, the date of which is uncertain,¹⁶⁹ all of these patrons were members of Cecil's immediate circle or, in the case of Compton and Stafford, of the neighbouring peer group in Northamptonshire. Furthermore, these were all patrons who could expect to entertain the queen and court. Cecil kept in touch with the Shrewsburys' buildings on his visits to the health spa at Buxton, and the earl sought his advice over building.¹⁷⁰ In 1573 Cecil wrote "wishing myself with hir [Bess] at Chattersworth when I think I shuld se a gret alteration to my good likyng".¹⁷¹

Apart from Copt Hall, Gidea, Slaugham and Theobalds which also had outward and inward facing loggias, all of these loggias were contained within the main courtyard of the house, where, as discussed below, there was very probably also an early loggia at Burghley c.1563.

The variety of functions catered for by the networks of open and closed galleries in Tudor palaces has been extensively discussed elsewhere.¹⁷² It is not surprising to find Cecil taking up and developing a new form of these practical constructions which were so useful and adaptable to numerous aspects of the life of the court, as a more compactly integrated feature of a house intended to play host to its members. Nor is it surprising that the idea was followed by others building with the same possibility in mind. A loggia facing onto the new terrace at Windsor was also included on Henry Hawthorn's plans for work for the queen in 1576 in which Cecil was so closely involved.¹⁷³

Open loggias or galleries mediate between the interior and exterior spaces and provide sheltered and sociable communicating links between one area and another. They constitute ideal spectating spaces catering for large numbers, creating a theatre-in-the-round when encompassing a courtyard, as at Whitehall, and doubling-up as recreational spaces surrounding enclosed gardens, as described at Richmond in 1501:

"both pleasant galerys and housis of pleasure to disporte in, at chessetables, discardes, byles bowling aleys, butts for archers and goodly tenes plays, as well to use the seid plays and disports as to behold them so disporting".¹⁷⁴

The south loggia at Burghley, however, marks a new departure, not only as outlined above but, as Kemp's letter makes clear, by being conceived as an outward-looking belvedere. It overlooked not only the south garden, but had a further view of the landscape beyond.

Fundamental elements of the end-plan of Cecil's building activities at Burghley as completed c.1587 were already established in the west and south ranges by the early 1560s. The west range was to be replaced, but by a new range also containing lodging suites on the ground floor, a main reception room in the form of a long gallery on the first floor, and an attic gallery above. The great chamber and attendant chambers of a state suite were to remain in the piano nobile of the south range, and like the open loggia below the earlier rooms were almost certainly absorbed into the later development. The same pattern with the principal rooms above a loggia overlooking the gardens was also adopted at Theobalds.¹⁷⁵ The following chapter examines whether this consistency of policy was also true of the east and north ranges.

-
- 1 L & P Vol XX pt 2, 455
 - 2 Bridges 1791, 578
 - 3 Read 1955, 18
 - 4 This is just north of the existing Hereford/Abergavenny road). Almost certainly
he came to fight on the side of his fellow Welshman, Henry Tudor
 - 5 Aubrey Ed. Barber 1982, 69
 - 6 HMC Salisbury Vol I, 434
 - 7 Rowse 1960, 61; Beckingsale 1967, 5 & 6; Cal Pat. Rolls 1494-1509, 410, 498
 - 8 Mellows 1939, 11
 - 9 Beckingsale 1967, 6; L & P Vol I, 40; Vol II pt 2, 1128
 - 10 Cecil took over half way through the year on the death of William Spenser.
Although beginning to decline, sheriff was still the most powerful county office
in the middle of the sixteenth century (A.G. Smith 1984, 134)
 - 11 Read 1955, 18, David Cecil was described as "yeoman" in the late fifteenth
century
 - 12 VCH Northants. Vol II, 256
 - 13 Exeter MSS E89/1
 - 14 Appendix A, 2 ln. 24. Bridges 1791, 588 The Priory of St Michael's has been
confused with the site of Burghley House (OS Grid Ref TF/049-/061) The SMR
reference for Burghley House makes the situation clear: "The DOE list states that
the remains of St Michael's Priory stand on this site and that the chapel, hall and
kitchen were incorporated in the present house. This belief appears to have
originated with Charlton (Dugdale Monasticon 1846, 4, 258-9) but is incorrect.
St Michael's Priory Lincs was situated in Stamford (TF 00NW 22), but passed into
the ownership of the Burghley estate in 1540." (Cambridge CC SMR reference
Document ARCH00018, 150.)
 - 15 Clapham Ed. Read & Read 1951, 72
 - 16 Rowse 1960, 61 & 66
 - 17 Cal Pat. Rolls Ed. VI, ii, 354
 - 18 Read 1955, 52
 - 19 Cal SP Dom. 10/7/43
 - 20 HMC Salisbury Vol 2, 119 "well I know that these twenty years was not done so much for the
cleansing of the sewers as is and shall be done this present year"
 - 21 Rowse 1960, 67; Cal Pat. Rolls Ed. VI, iv, 197
 - 22 Read 1955, 88; Cal Pat. Rolls Ed. VI, v, 182
 - 23 BL Lansdowne MSS, cxviii f.23. List in Cecil's hand made c. 1558- 60
 - 24 Finch 1956, 14-15 quoting John Isham's Book of Evidences, 4084, 17-22
(Northants. Records Office)
 - 25 Read 1955, 88. His income from offices, recorded at the same time was just over
that directly derived from lands. Declaration of his formal income has of course
to be treated with some caution. The much-quoted document, for example, which
has survived despite the endorsement "this note to be burned", written in the late
1590s, refers to his income derived from the mastership of the Court of Wards.
Over a three year period Cecil received more than £3000 from the sale of
wardships. The official salary during this time was a mere £332 while the Crown
received only £906 in profit, and Cecil's revenue from this source was probably at
or above this level during most of his Mastership which began in 1561. (Hursfield
1949, 108-109; Guy 1991, 395)
 - 26 Read 1955, 192; Cal Pat. Rolls Elizabeth i, 44, 165
 - 27 In Peck 1732-5 Vol 1 Lib I Ch 1, 2-3

-
- 28 Rowse 1960, 62
 29 Tytler 1839 Vol II, no 430
 30 T. Wright 1838 Vol I, 391
 31 Bacon Ed. Hawkins 1972, 41
 32 De Officiis was addressed to his son, Marcus
 33 Harleian MSS 3638 f. 106, printed in LB Wright 1962, 10
 34 For example SP Dom12/193/28 (1586) and SP Dom 12/201/40 (1587) Cecil refers
 to Burghley as his "principal" house in both cases, and to Northamptonshire as the
 county "where I am no new planted or new feathered gentleman" (12/193/28)
 35 Read 1955, 78
 36 L.B. Wright 1962, 10
 37 "I find the worke at Henderscelf to go on with vigour and grt industry altho there
 is not soe much done as I expected by this time but the impediment has been the
 backward season which has much obstructed us. I am come time enough to regulate
 some errors and difficultys the workmen were going into, and in generall the
 worke is firme and strongly performed; the situation yr Lp has chose is under
 covert of ye Wood but it runs into some hardships about levelling & makeing our
 access to ye great facade and principall courts, I am taking all the declivitys and
 dispositons of ye ground at present..... I desire the mason to sett on more hands
 that we may complete with expedition the two wings, and to do that will require
 another kil[n] for lime. The coals come hard but now is the season to gett them..."
 (Saumarez Smith 1990, 51)
 38 Appendix A
 39 Summerson 1986, 46
 40 Appendix A, 4, ln.1-2
 41 Barnett 1969, 23
 42 Read 1955, 106, the first time he had done so since Mary came to the throne. The
 house at Wimbledon was leased and Cecil maintained a large household there until
 he moved to Theobalds. (see Higham 1962)
 43 Barnett 1969, 24
 44 HMC Salisbury Vol I, 531
 45 SP Dom. 11/8/38
 46 Lansdowne MSS Vol 3 f.120
 47 Appendix B, 4, sheet 2
 48 HMC Salisbury Vol I, 502
 49 Appendix B, 1. The spelling here is "John Norys" and several different spellings
 occur in the correspondence, as was common in the period. For convenience
 'Norris' is used throughout in the text, where not making a direct quotation.
 50 Appendix A, 1, lns. 4-5
 51 Appendix B, 1, lns. 5-6
 52 Appendix B, 4, sheet 2
 53 Appendix A, 9, ln. 2
 54 RCHM, unpublished report, Dingley Hall, NBR File: 61862, 4
 55 King's Works III, 415 & 303
 56 Appendix A, 1, lns. 4-5
 57 Appendix B, 2, ln. 29
 58 Girouard 1973, 1669. In Girouard 1983, 117, the name in the reference to this
 document is spelt as "Roger Worthe", which makes the connection less likely,
 although Girouard gives no footnote regarding the change. Hussey refers to the
 Chatsworth reference as "Ward" (Hussey 1953, 1831 fn)
 59 Appendix B, 4, sheet 1 (recto)

-
- 60 Girouard 1973, 1669
- 61 Clark-Maxwell 1913, 179; letter printed in Wilts. Arch. Mag. Vol XXVI, 50
- 62 Appendix A, 3, ln. 20
- 63 King's Works III, 325; SP Dom. 12/105/78. As with Norris the alternative spellings of the same name would not be unusual
- 64 King's Works III, 325; SP Dom.12/109/31.Hawthorne as mentioned in Chapter 1, already had a close association with Cecil and had worked for him at Theobalds
- 65 Mellows Ed.1956 17-18, ('Elizabethan Peterborough')
- 66 Appendix A, 3, ln. 24
- 67 Exeter MSS E 80/8
- 68 Barnett 1969, 123-4; PRO Wards 9/381. Even though the designation was not as significant as it was up to the middle of the century, it is easy to underestimate Kemp's standing from the tone of the letters to Cecil, taken in isolation from the conventions of the period
- 69 Girouard 1959, 200-204
- 70 Sandeen (Thesis) 1959. There are references to Bacon's control of works throughout the thesis
- 71 Clapham, in Eds Read & Read 1951, 83
- 72 Appendix A, 8, ln. 15
- 73 Tytler 1839 Vol 2, 282 Abraham refers to a "Hall" in his letter of 13 June 1556 who was measuring for the pipe work between the house and the conduit, but as this Hall was also going to carry out the work this appears to refer to a different man. Appendix A, 2, lns. 24-31
- 74 Appendix A, 9
- 75 Appendix A, 8, lns. 13-16
- 76 Appendix A, 9, lns. 24-45
- 77 Quoted in Beckingsale 1967, 70, Cal SP Spanish 1558-67, 7
- 78 See, for example, his instructions for the Commission appointed to treat with the French in Scotland in 1560, summarized by Read 1955, 174
- 79 Appendix B, 4, sheet 1 (verso)
- 80 Appendix A, 1, lns. 2-12
- 81 Plan was enclosed with the letter Appendix A, 3. The 'Stranger's Stable' is sited over the path of the water supply pipe. In Appendix A ,4 Kemp assures Cecil "for the water I wyll undertake yt the stable shall not corrupt it, I wyll turne it so frome the course yt hethe now"
- 82 See for example Hatfield MSS 143,24, 27& 28, 29&30, 31&32, 33, 37 & 38, 41 & 42, 46, 47, 48, 50
- 83 Cal SP Scottish 1547-63, no 248
- 84 King's Works IV, 46; E403/2726
- 85 King's Works IV, 46. Hatfield MSS 111/151
- 86 This has also been found to be the case with Thorpe's plan of Audley End, concluded therefore by Drury to be a survey not a design (Drury 1980, 16-17)
- 87 Wilson (Unpublished) 1982-1994 Vol II, 10 & 14 -
- 88 We are extremely fortunate to have both ground-floor and first-floor plans for a house of this date when the ratio of ground-floor to first-floor plans available is about 50:1. (see Introduction) (Information supplied by Nicholas Cooper)
- 89 Appendix A, 1, lns. 2-12
- 90 Appendix A, 1, lns. 7 & 16
- 91 McKean 1979, 22, referring to Sebastiano Serlio Book 7 first published Frankfurt 1575
- 92 Hussey 1953, 1554

-
- 93 Drury 1983, 110
- 94 Appendix B, 4, sheet 2. By this date the term "slaytor" could, however, also be used for those undertaking plasterwork
- 95 Clifton-Taylor 1987, 104
- 96 Appendix B, 3
- 97 Appendix A, 1, ln 5
- 98 Appendix B, 2, lns. 29-30
- 99 The earliest reference I can find to a "French" window in England is some sixty years later. John Smythson used the term much as we understand it today on a design for the marble closet at Bolsover Castle. These windows were based on windows probably designed by Inigo Jones seen by Smythson on his 1618- 19 visit to London. (Girouard 1983)
- 100 Summerson 1959, Plate XXVIII
- 101 There was a long gallery over the hall, (Parliamentary Survey PRO E317/Herts/26 f.10
- 102 Drury 1983, 110. The courtyard aedicule, destroyed by Blomfield when he remodelled the house (1909-12) is recorded on photograph and the dormers on the south front, shown in the photograph of 1917, which had been "much rebuilt" although in Drury's view probably similar to the originals, were destroyed in the fire of 1969
- 103 Thomson 1994, 221
- 104 Thomson 1994, 225
- 105 Cabala 1691, 141
- 106 Summerson 1949, 292
- 107 Summerson 1949, 293
- 108 Hatfield MSS CP 151/140. The missing word was too indistinct to decipher on the BL microfilm copy from which this was transcribed, possibly 'mason's'
- 109 Long 1941, 346
- 110 Long 1941, 344
- 111 Blunt 1969, 29. For Broughton Castle see Slade 1978,139-156, and for Winchester, Biddle Ed. Crook 1993, 257-304, esp. 281-296
- 112 Blunt 1969, 29
- 113 Hoby Ed. Powell 1902, 127
- 114 Appendix B, 3. As referenced in Chapter 1, the Hobys spent the summer at Burghley (Hoby Ed. Powell 1902, 127)
- 115 Appendix A, 1, lns. 12-14
- 116 Appendix B, 4; Appendix A, 3 & 4. The positioning of these areas is discussed fully in the "Gardens and Estate" chapter 3
- 117 William's father had a brother David, about whom very little is known, and this almost certainly refers to him. Elsewhere Cecil refers to "my uncle Heckington" when referring to his maternal uncle.(BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 3, 129 & 118)As his accommodation was in the main lodging range, it seems more likely that he would have been a long-stay guest like the Hobys, rather than a permanent resident like Cecil's mother was until 1556
- 118 Appendix B No 4
- 119 Coope has identified a number of attic galleries on the second floor dating from around this time or earlier, including Fawsley Hall, also in Northamptonshire (c.1542) Barrington Court (1550s or 1560s) Grove Place (1561-64) (Coope 1986, 54-55) and of course Chatsworth, where there was a full suite of state rooms on the second floor including a gallery, probably dating from between 1568-1576 (Girouard 1983, 116-117). The gable windows side by side suggest possibly a hipped roof, like that of Richard Clough's Bachgraig of 1567. This also has

-
- chimneys rising from the hip of the roof. Cecil was involved with negotiations for the land for Clough and the Cecil arms were featured in the interior. Burgon 1839Vol.2 310-311
- 120 Nicholas 1847, 125-6
- 121 For example, see Howard 1987, 122
- 122 N. Cooper 'Sutton Place, East Barcham and some related houses: some problems arising', 35 in Ed. Airs 1994, 33-54
- 123 Cal SP Scottish 54/4; quoted in Sandeen 1959, and Airs 1975, 2
- 124 "Houses are built to live in, and not to look on; therefore let use be preferred before uniformity, except where both may be had" Bacon Ed. Hawkins 1972, 133
- 125 Boorde 1542 Ch. III Furnivall Ed. 1870, 235
- 126 Hamlet Act III, iii, 36
- 127 Shepherd 1989, 108; quote taken from Teares 1564-67
- 128 Appendix B, 3
- 129 Appendix B, 4, sheet 2
- 130 SP Dom. 15/20/43; Roman numerals have been changed to Arabic numbers for clarity.
- 131 Burgon 1839 Vol I, 394
- 132 Burgon 1839 Vol I, 408
- 133 Hussey 1953, 1830
- 134 King's Works IV, 347. There is a splendid tile pavement in the Grande Salle at Ecouen, a house which, as discussed below may have had a considerable influence on Burghley. A huge store of ceramic tiles has been found in an outhouse at Burghley. These are believed to date from the seventeenth century possibly associated with a "Tile Roome" listed in the 1688 inventory, (Leatham 1992, 221) but again these could possibly date from Cecil's time
- 135 PRO E317/Herts/26, 8, 12, 13
- 136 Waldstein f.149 Ed. Groos 1981, 83
- 137 Cal SP Foreign 1561-62, p125 Florence Diaceto to Wm. Cecil May 25 1561. There is an undated drawing at Hatfield specifying detailed dimensions for marble for a chimneypiece for Theobalds endorsed by Cecil which would appear to be information drawn up for an order of this sort (Hatfield MSS 143/34.)
- 138 Appendix A, 6, ln. 3 & A,7, ln. 17
- 139 Howard 1987, 194; British Library Egerton MSS 2851 Accounts of Duke of Somerset's cofferer, John Pickerell
- 140 As early as 1556 Abraham reported to Cecil that "yron spanyshe" could be bought in Peterborough for £12 a ton (Appendix A, 2, ln. 36) but in 1547 Nicholas Bacon had paid only £6 a ton for the same commodity in Ipswich (Sandeen 1959, 35-36). Even allowing for the fall in exchange rates during Mary's reign the price within the east of England as quoted to Abraham seems high by comparison and obviously £9 a ton from Antwerp was a better price.
- 141 Alberti Bk. V Ch XVII Ed. Leoni 1755, 107
- 142 Howard 1994, 257-269
- 143 The plan at Slaughtam cited by Howard has a great deal in common with that of Burghley as shown by Thorpe. That (also cited) of Buckhurst proposed for the new Lord Treasurer, as Summerson has noted, probably followed Cecil's example (Summerson 1966, 47). It is even possible that Thorpe may himself have drawn inspiration for his later ideas when he made his survey of Burghley in 1605/6.
- 144 An opening to what is assumed to be further space beyond this small chamber has been blocked by subsequent rubble infill. Access to this chamber is not available as it lies under the timber flooring in 026. I have only seen photographs and had a verbal account from Jon Culverhouse.

-
- 145 Summerson 1959, 110. Smith has found an isolated example of this occurring
under the colonnade at Hadham Hall in Hertfordshire (J.T. Smith 1992, 54) , and at
Burghley itself there are very shallow cellars under the south range beneath the
area which was an open loggia
- 146 Marshall, 79 in Airs Ed. 1994
- 147 Switzer notes of terraces that "wherever the house is to be new built, there is no
possibility of disposing of the Earth, clay, Rubbish etc. that necessarily comes out
of the Cellars and Foundations thereof" (S. Switzer Ichonographia Rustica or the
Nobleman, Gentleman and Gardener's Recreation 1718 Vol 2, 150, quoted in Steane
1977, 386). The upper layer of the limestone quarries invariably yields only
small blocks of stone.
- 148 See Appendix A, 9; and Chapter 4 for detailed analysis of the garden plan.
- 149 Appendix A, 6, Ins. 3-6
- 150 Appendix A, 7, Ins. 16-18
- 151 Appendix A, 3
- 152 This is almost too faint to show up on any reproduction of the plan.
- 153 Hatfield MSS Vol 143/41 & 42. A note repeating Cecil's instruction is inscribed in
another hand on the bay itself. (This drawing is discussed further in Chapter 4.)
- 154 The possibility of Ecouen as a source for features at Burghley is discussed fully
in Chapter 5
- 155 The possibility that there may have been a building on part of the site of the south
range, and that Cecil incorporated this into the fabric of the new building is
discussed in Chapter 3
- 156 Girouard 1959, 219;
- 157 Girouard 1959, 209
- 158 Girouard 1983, 152, and see Henderson 1995, 109-146
- 159 These are now badly weathered, but recorded in photograph (Clark-Maxwell 1913,
Plate IV facing page 180)
- 160 Clark-Maxwell 1913, 181, the structure itself was probably never built
- 161 Thurley 1991, 200
- 162 The loggias shown on Thorpe's plan of Somerset House meanwhile are now
recognized as dating from the seventeenth century, when the stone courtyard
gallery replaced an earlier wooden structure. (King's Works IV, 254 & 256)
- 163 Vitruvius Book V, xi, Trans. Hickey Morgan 1960, 160
- 164 Cicero trans. Dolman 1961, f. J4-J5
- 165 Pliny the Younger Book V letter 6 Ed. & trans. Radice 1969, 141
- 166 See Chapter 1
- 167 Read 1955, 115
- 168 The evidence is inconclusive as to whether there was an entrance range loggia here
in the sixteenth century, but one is included in RCHME's conjectural
reconstruction plan of the sixteenth century house (RCHME Unpublished Reports
Northants Houses, NBR File 61855)
- 169 See Girouard 1964, 70-73. There are however, a surprising number of features at
Slaugham, which have affinities with Burghley, including similarities in the
plan, which are touched upon later in the thesis and which warrant further
research.
- 170 In 1577 Shrewsbury sent Cecil an elevation of a lodge asking for his comments
(Girouard 1983, 13 from College of Arms, Talbot MSS Vol P. f 837, 5th August
1577)
- 171 Girouard 1973, 1699
- 172 King's Works IV, 17-20; Thurley 1993, 141-3

-
- 173 St John Hope 1913, 277 A note on the plan for part of the terrace measuring 74ft x 16ft x 4ft 6ins (22.7m x 4.8m x 1.5m) states "this rome would be covered with lead having open arches"
- 174 King's Works IV, 228; College of Arms MS.M13, 61-63; printed in F Grose Antiquarian Repetory 1808, ii
- 175 See Summerson's reconstruction plan (Summerson 1959, 119)

CHAPTER THREE : THE HOUSE OF CECIL 1553-1566: PART 2

The East Range

The plan of the east range is the most complex part of the house as it appears in Thorpe's plans of the ground and first floors, and as it is today. As this is a key area of the first phase house which also helps to explain a number of later developments, its archaeology in conjunction with documentary evidence are analysed in detail. It is evident from the documents that the great hall in Cecil's first building phase was not the present-day great hall which features in Thorpe's plans of 1605/6. There is no mention by name of an 'east' range identified by its cardinal position, but in the plan of this building phase, like its surviving successor the early great hall must have been at the southern end of the east range.

Although the double pile was already evident in hall ranges of courtyard houses by the early sixteenth century,¹ the siting of the present great hall in the outer width rather than adjacent to the courtyard is more unusual. The presence of windows shown on the hall's internal west wall, facing eastwards into the hall, in Thorpe's ground floor plan (W/T012/11 and W/T012/10), is consistent with the theory that the present hall was added onto the exterior east wall of an existing range in the later phase of Cecil's building, sometime between 1570 and 1587.² Although internal windows such as these were not an uncommon feature in sixteenth-century houses, this theory was further corroborated when investigations from the roof of the "Dark Nursery" (Room 150), made by Alan Wilson, revealed that this west wall of the present great hall was not, as had been thought, a solid wall c.5ft 10ins (1.7m) thick, but a double skin wall with a narrow void in between the west and east faces. Furthermore, Wilson observed the exterior face of an east facing blocked window which approximated to the position of W/T012/11 on Thorpe's ground-floor plan. The window appeared to be located on a level that would be about half-way between the hall floor and the corbels of the hall roof. It is, however, on the west part of

the double skin, not on the east side of this wall. It was somewhat high-set to feature on the ground-floor plan, but visual access was not good enough to establish whether there was originally a corresponding opening in the east wall, as is implied by Thorpe's plan.³

As we have seen, the great chamber and chapel were in the south range, with the most likely siting of the chapel at its eastern end. This whole disposition, if the earlier hall was at the south end of the east range, is as one might expect with the entrance in the west range. It conformed to the most conventional courtyard plan, as recommended by Andrew Boorde in his Compendyous Regyment or a Dyetary of Helth of 1542:

"let the gate-howse be opposyt or agaynst the hall-dore (not dyrectly) but the hall-dore standynge a base, and the gate-howse in the mydle of the front entrynge in to the place: let the pryue chamber be anaxed to the chambre of astate, with other chambres necessarye for the buyldnge, so that many of the chambres maye haue a prospecte in to the Chapell".⁴

The first mention of what is taken to be the east range is in Norris's letter of 15 May 1556 when he reported to Cecil that the partition above the screens was completed.⁵ The hall must, therefore, have risen through two storeys, apart from the screens passage which perhaps had a lobby above, as was the arrangement at Chatsworth by the end of the sixteenth century, as shown on Girouard's reconstruction plan of the house (Plan 14a).⁶

Norris's letter continues "we have had much labour of your screens" and he wanted to know "further of yo[^] pleasure" when he came up to see Cecil, implying that the screen was being made to a fairly elaborate design. Cecil had been at Burghley in March with Nicholas Bacon. They went first to Bacon's recently completed house at Redgrave in Suffolk⁷ and no doubt they were both anxious to see not only their own houses but to compare them against the latest developments of the other's new buildings.

The roof, Norris informed Cecil, had been "taken down to the kitchen" (i.e. its frame had been constructed as far as the kitchen) and they hoped to "set it up" (cover it) by Whitsuntide (on 24 May that year).⁸ This cannot have included the hall roof which must already have existed as they were already fitting out the hall interior. The kitchen roof itself, Norris continued, would not be started until after the holiday. Cecil must have been displeased with the rate of progress as reported by Norris on 15 May, for in Abraham's letter of 13 June, he apologised profusely that "yo^r buldynges are in no more redines" and he had taken on four extra carpenters "although workemē are dear" so that the next and "greatest pese of worke"⁹ of the kitchen roof could be speeded up to be back on schedule by the time of Cecil's visit, which, unfortunately for the officers, he had put forward from July to late June.

By the winter of 1556 the Burghley kitchen was completed, but not in use as a kitchen because the men were using it as accommodation and Abraham was asking Cecil if they could move elsewhere as it was so cold,¹⁰ which suggests that it was exposed in some way from the sheltering bulk of the main body of the house, most probably on the cold north-east corner of the building. As it had an independent roof rather than having "a floor over" there were no rooms above it. Stone-walled kitchens with high timber-framed roofs were more common in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries than more costly stone vaulted chambers like that of the existing kitchen at Burghley. One has to go only as far as Gainsborough Old Hall in Lincolnshire to see a magnificent (partially reconstructed) late mediaeval example of the sort of semi-independent structure with a timber roof which seems to have been going up at Burghley.

Norris's letter of 15 May continued that "yo[^] pantry is fynyshede in tymberwork"¹¹ so the internal walls were timber-framed partitions rather than masonry.¹² The floors had been raised over the dry larder where "yo[^] steps be apoynted". Because there was still a discrepancy between the raised floor and that of the parlour (it is not clear whether this means a floor 'over', or 'of', the parlour), there had to be a step of 6 inches.

Two further steps of 5 inches a piece "going into your new galary", and another step of 5 inches into the "chamber ov^e the bachowse" were needed; so obviously all these areas interconnected. Norris concluded that partitions had been set up around the stairs but the stairs themselves had not yet been installed, so this must refer to different steps from those over the dry larder which had already been appointed. The difficulties in reconciling the floor levels and the patching in of areas of flooring imply that they were building onto or over a pre-existing structure where the ground floor 'level' was anything but level, as is still the case throughout the east range where the exterior ground level rises in two planes, north to south and west to east.

The work going on at this time appears to have been concentrated in the one area and by 13 June 1556 Abraham reported that six loads of freshly burnt plaster had been used for the pantry and the partition over the screen, though the screen itself was still not in place. Another twenty-six loads were expected and with this, he was confident they should finish with the "flores in yo^r galere be maid & ye rooffe seled plast^d", so the gallery must have been a fairly large area.¹³ Abraham refers to "Your plaster" coming from "Sesterne", just over the Leicestershire border in an area where Cecil had property, and this may have been his own resource.¹⁴ A map of Cliffe Park in the Burghley archives made by Richard Shute in 1593 shows a "lyming house", so as with the stone, Cecil no doubt also used the land of which he was 'Keeper' for supplying and processing this raw material used so extensively at Burghley.¹⁵ The gallery must be the "new gallery" referred to by Norris.¹⁶ Again one cannot be certain whether the "flores" mean ceilings, but the quantity of plaster suggest both floor and ceiling were plaster. Plaster floors were quite common in the sixteenth century. The gallery dating from the 1590s of Thomas Tresham's Rushton Hall, Northamptonshire, had one, for instance. There are surviving plaster floors in other areas at Burghley including over the present great kitchen (002), and, in the prospect room at roof level over the west central gate- tower (325 Plan F8). These are reinforced with rushes, in the manner noted by John Speed in 1611 "wherewith they flower

their upper rooms; for betwixt the ioyst they lay only long Bulrushes, and thereon spread this Plaister"¹⁷ (Fig.3.1).

Abraham's letter of 15 May 1556, (the same date as Norris's report) concerns furniture being made for the hall. It details that the distance "from [word missing where the page is torn] ye parlour dor to ye skrenes is xxiii foote and di" (23 1/2 ft , 7.2m). "...on the other same side of the hall" (i.e. the opposite wall) was where "the little table did stand". The little table was 7ft (2.15m) and the long table 15 ft 6ins (4.8m) .¹⁸ This parlour must be a different one from that mentioned in the area of the kitchen services by Norris which is later referred to as the "little parlour".¹⁹ Abraham refers to tables again in his next surviving letter sent a month later on 13 June.²⁰ The long table was 2ft 2ins (0.76m) wide while the "other side table may be ix foote & iij foote to spare" (2.74m & 0.9m). The latter table must have been designed to be placed along the side wall on the dais, implying that the dais was 12 ft (3.9 m) from front to back, while the "little" table mentioned in the first letter stood on the side wall of the main body of the hall, below the dais. The distance from the dais (half-pace meaning the dais step)²¹ to the screen meanwhile was 20ft 9ins (6.3m). The difference in measurement between dais and screen, and that given for between parlour door and screen implies that a door leading to the parlour opened off the dais some 2ft 9ins (0.85m) back from its leading edge. Abraham now has it as three feet from the half-pace, no doubt a revised measurement superseding the earlier letter. The overall length of the hall would thus have been 32 ft 9 ins (9.98m), not including the screens passage. This would make it similar in length to the hall at Longleat at this time (35 ft (10.66 m)) and, one can reasonably assume, of approximately the same width (Longleat 22 ft (6.69 m)), or probably a few feet wider to accommodate comfortably the long table and the width of the side table .²² This hall therefore, was considerably smaller than the existing great hall (68 ft x 30 ft (20 x 9.1 m)). (See Plan 15)

How then can one determine that this hall was in the southern end of the east range? In November 1561 Kemp explained to Cecil that the quarry in the garden was "at the dore

y^t leadethe thorow by the parlar dore into the gardyn".²³ Three months later in February 1561/62 Kemp clarified the position "the quarry in the garden riseth straight east and not past xij foot without the range of the south side of the house".²⁴ The ground rises most noticeably at the eastern end of the south range. The quarried bedrock cellar floors that lie only about three to four feet under their brick-lined barrel vaults, where above Thorpe shows the south loggia (T/052), indicate that the limestone seam was close to the ground surface in this area. As the door leading to the parlour from the hall was off the side wall of the dais, if the hall was in the east range, it must have been towards the south end of the range, with the screens passage at its northern end, as one would expect with the great chamber in the south range, "upon my garden".²⁵ The dimensions inferred from the correspondence are compatible with the rooms in the southern half of the courtyard width of the east range as shown on Thorpe (T/049 & T/050). The ground plan of these rooms is now occupied by 050, 051 & part of 049, which approximate to the same size and are consistent with the positioning of a great hall, with a screens passage leading from or around the mid-point of the east end of the courtyard.²⁶

There really is no other position which the early hall could have occupied. We know from the Masons' Schedule that neither the hall nor the parlour were in the west range. A south range accommodating a loggia and a hall and parlour in the midst of the ground floor would have had to be much wider than as shown on Thorpe, and there are no signs in the cellars that this was or has ever been the case. As the hall was double-height, it would be very unlikely for a sixteenth-century house, even one dating from early in the century, to have been on the first floor.²⁷

An east/west oriented hall at the extreme east end of the south range would mean a screens passage at its west end, in order to lead from the courtyard, in which case the parlour would have had to project either further to the east or south to be near the south garden quarry, and the great chamber would have been at the low end of the great hall. Moreover, the window observed by Wilson, approximating with W/T012/10 implies an

outside wall, marking the eastern-most extent of the house before the present great hall was added. But Edmund Hall's report of 1564 makes it clear there was an important chamber on the far side of the "main" wall of the hall, which is taken to mean the wall at the head of the hall behind the dais. Furthermore, if this was so, then according to Hall's report, the orientation of the hall was north/south not east/west.²⁸ It cannot have been in the north range or in the northern half of the east range because of the positioning of the other principal chambers and the parlour. There is also evidence that cooking took place in what is now the 'Hog's Hall' (001) before the second phase of Cecil's building, which again is compatible with this hall position, the kitchen offices being beyond the screens passage in the northern half of the east range.²⁹

Was this then a new hall Cecil was building in 1556 or was he revamping his father's hall? If, as one might expect, the pattern of dining was the same as in Cecil's household at Wimbledon at this time, then the family ate in the great chamber, the officers in the parlour, and the lower servants in the hall,³⁰ and there would have been no need for a giant hall in the everyday life of the household. Cecil's arrangement at Wimbledon reflected the royal pattern adopted by Henry VIII whose preference was for privacy within an intimate inner circle of the court.³¹ As Thurley has shown, the great hall was dropped altogether from the plan of Henry's later palaces³² but a private owner still needed to retain a great hall both for its symbolic value as the signifier of hospitality and as the vehicle for hospitality itself.

When the Duke of Northumberland honoured Cecil father and son with a visit to Burghley on his way to war in Scotland in 1552, he was travelling with a retinue fit for the king whose power he exercised. However, he received hospitality only "at the door" because, he claimed, "my train is so great and will be whether I will or not".³³ Despite the reputation for great "port" or hospitality that was asserted for Richard Cecil by William Cecil's household biographer at the beginning of the seventeenth century,³⁴ this suggests that there was no great hall of magnificent size in his house and the relatively modest

dimensions given by Abraham would therefore be consistent with an inherited hall. There would have been no necessity for Cecil to enlarge the hall in order to keep pace with the prevailing trend in the mid-1550s or early 1560s; rather the opposite in fact.³⁵

The archaeology of the existing building tends to support the hypothesis that Cecil incorporated his father's buildings into his work at the east as well as the west end of the courtyard. As can be seen from the RCHME plan, the south wall of the courtyard is not set at right angles to what was the east wall (now behind Gandy Deering's corridors). It veers slightly northward for a few metres and then southward by approximately 5° (see Plan 3b). Over a length of 119 ft (36.5 m) this means the western side of the original courtyard was approximately 5 ft (1.5 m) to the south of the eastern side. As a result, the courtyard is not a regular rectangle and its west and east sides are not axially aligned, nor are they parallel (see Plans F3 & 11). In Cecil's later building phase this was to pose considerable problems for the executors.³⁶

It seems probable that this irrationality was the result of an inherited ground plan in which symmetry had not been a primary consideration. It is less likely that Cecil would have accepted such oddly misaligned buildings if he had the freedom of constructing on a virgin site at either the west or the east end of the courtyard. He was, after all, already preoccupied with symmetry and the logical arrangement of the fenestration in the first building phase. A plan of Theobalds shows how irregular building that probably came with the property were incorporated to form the side ranges of the entrance court and had to be ironed out to agree with the new symmetrical lay-out. (Plan 16).³⁷ The buildings Cecil inherited at Burghley may similarly not even have constituted a formal courtyard house, but a looser collection of structures massed about a central yard, as seems to have been the configuration of the original house Francis Willoughby inherited at Wollaton, for example.³⁸

In his Memorial the list for the carpenters at Burghley includes "to make a floore over ye armory"³⁹ which further suggests that he was incorporating the old house. By the mid-sixteenth century, storage of arms on a large scale in country houses was becoming less common than earlier practice, and even politically sensitive in some cases.⁴⁰ Although during the Northern Rising Cecil was to send a consignment of "ordinances" to Admiral Clinton from Burghley in 1569, it seems unlikely that he would purpose-build something that, as Howard points out, was already becoming an anachronism by the end of Henry VIII's reign.⁴¹

As Roger North reflected in the following century, "I come to observe what a benefit a reformer of his old family seat hath. He can after all call it an old house, which by the force of modesty sets it off, and if anything be good it is better accepted for it".⁴² Cecil's well known description playing down Burghley House made in 1585 - "And for my buildings there I have set my walls upon the old foundation. Indeed I have made the rough stone walls to be of square and yet one side remaineth as my father left it to me"⁴³ - was in response to alleged attacks on the magnificence of his buildings by his political enemies. He was quite capable of being economical with the truth when it came to defending his own actions. But as one of the key advantages of Burghley in Cecil's dynastic strategy was the authority it conferred by being an inherited family seat, part of this aspect of his defence at least is most probably founded on reality. When he did build a huge new hall and kitchen, it was in these areas which were most closely associated with the tradition of open hospitality that he retained the appearance of a more familiar vernacular style than that adopted elsewhere for the architecture of the house. Nor was the old hall pulled down; it was absorbed into the remodelled building. At Theobalds in Hertfordshire where, by contrast, as he himself admitted, he was "homo novus",⁴⁴ the existing house that he bought with the property in 1563/4 had no such emotive socio-political meaning, and he opted to build his new mansion on a green field part of the site. Even so, he still first explored the possibility of converting the 'old' house, as surviving plans for its proposed development confirm.⁴⁵ Overall there are strong arguments for the hypothesis that Cecil

incorporated his father's hall and probably large parts of the earlier house into his new building at this stage.

Meanwhile the consistent three-light fenestration pattern being introduced in the west and south ranges seems to have been carried through to the east range. The internal (formerly external) hall windows shown in Thorpe's plan (W/T012/10 & W/T012/11) have three lights. The same is true of a surviving window, first noted by Gotch in 1904,⁴⁶ and now only accessible through a hatch in the ceiling over the stairs to the gallery of the present great hall, (window marked 'D' on Plan 3c). Like the Thorpe windows, this was originally an external window facing eastwards and must also have become an internal window when the range was extended eastwards in the second phase of Cecil's building, or it may have become redundant as it is today.⁴⁷ Thorpe shows a doorway on the first-floor plan that approximates to this position, but no window. This is, however, in the area where the dimensions of his plans suggest some concertinering of the space represented.

In Kemp's letter of 18 October 1561,⁴⁸ he reported that the "hall is halfe selyd w^t plaster over the head w^c shewthe vere fayre". This is taken by Hussey and Girouard to mean that the hall had a plaster ceiling that was in the process of completion.⁴⁹ The term "selyd" or "celyd" in the sixteenth century, however, commonly referred to timber panelling rather than signifying a plaster "ceiling".⁵⁰ When Abraham had used the term to mean a plaster work ceiling in 1556, he made it clear by qualifying the phrase "ye roof seled plastered".⁵¹ Timber wainscoting makes more sense if Kemp's reference is to the same hall as in the 1556 letters, because the hall was already roofed at that date and complete enough to be furnished and fitted out with the timber screen and plastered partition above. It would denote that, as part of the general increase in standards of luxury that Cecil was introducing, the hall was now being embellished with panelling up to head-height or thereabouts (i.e. half-way up the wall) with the plaster exposed on the wall above, "over the head". The hall at Theobalds similarly had panelling on the walls, at least by the

time of the parliamentary survey of 1650,⁵² and this sort of arrangement was becoming the most fashionable decorative style by the second half of the sixteenth century, and can still be seen in the hall at Deene Park, for instance, where the rather higher panelling behind the dais dates from the 1570s (Fig 3.2).

Cecil seems to have been thinking about the hall again early in 1563. On 11 February 1562/63, Kemp had written to him about various estate matters at Burghley.⁵³ There is no mention of the hall range, but on the back of the letter is a freehand sketch which almost certainly was made by Cecil (Plan 18).⁵⁴ As the letter concerns Burghley, then one would expect a sketch by the methodical Cecil, who frequently visualized his thoughts in this way, to refer to the same location.⁵⁵

The little sketch is in a similar style to other free-hand drawings by Cecil and is a good example of his competence in drawing up understandable plans and ability to conceive or plot architectural ideas using fluent visual shorthand. The dotted lines in the sketch imply a screens passage. If the original hall was at the higher level of the present great hall, as discussed below, then the short flight of straight stairs, leading downwards to kitchen offices, would be in the expected place in the sketch. Given that Cecil drew to a roughly approximate scale, if the screens passage is about 8 ft wide, the hall equals approximately 25 ft. wide (2.43m & 7.62m). If the sketch is related to the earlier hall at Burghley in the east range, it indicates a central fireplace on the east wall and a bay window opposite looking onto the courtyard - as one finds at Hengrave Hall or Rushton, for example. On a plan of an unknown house by John Symonds in the Hatfield collection there is also an example of a hall with a central bay window on its long side.⁵⁶ If at Burghley the parlour door led off the dais on one side with the side table against the wall on the other, there could not have been a bay window at the dais end. Also, there was only space for a "little" table along the wall in the main body of the hall which suggests there were other features in this area such as a bay window and fireplace. The room and corridor shown beyond the hall on the same side as the fireplace in the sketch, could be

part of a service range or court that may have existed behind the kitchen offices at the north-east end of the house.⁵⁷ The lines on either side of the entrance into the lobby on the other side, suggest this indicates a narrow structure not a full width range. One would expect some quite important porch here, marking the formal entrance to the hall in the traditional manner, even in Richard Cecil's time. Is one possibly seeing Cecil delineating the idea of moving or altering an externally slightly off-centre porch entrance, to make an entrance that would lead, or appear to lead from the mid-point of the courtyard front? The evidence of the standing fabric suggests that this is what happened at some point in Cecil's architectural development of the house.

One can see from the RCHME plan how the frontispiece of the clock-tower does not align precisely with the entrance into the 'Saloon' (049). "Frontispiece" is an apt description. The fact that what goes on behind its façade does not tally with the face it presents to the courtyard is even more apparent from the plan of the second floor of room 247, (see Plan 5a marked A). In order to appear to be symmetrical about the central axis, the southern side of the frontispiece structure has had to be extended. Whatever date the second storey in its present form may have been constructed, the die was cast by the disposition of the lower levels (the room behind the clock-tower which is aligned with the 'front' of the frontispiece (246 on Plan 5a) is a later addition of the seventeenth century.)⁵⁸

Two weeks before Cecil received the letter from Kemp on which the sketch appears, he had a letter, dated 28th January 1562/3, from Richard Clough, Thomas Gresham's agent in Antwerp. Cecil had ordered a stone gallery to be made up for him in Flanders and had sent a pattern to Clough which Clough was returning, having spoken to the Antwerp mason, so that Cecil could confer with his mason at home and revise the plan to show "the whole ground how the gallery shall stand". The Antwerp mason advised that the gallery pillars should be monolithic and the arches "accordingly" either "antyke" or modern.⁵⁹ Gotch, Hussey and Summerson have associated this with the gallery at the

eastern end of the courtyard, although, as with the goods invoiced by Mount and Gresham, the gallery could have been ordered for Cecil House.⁶⁰ However, as the south front already featured a new classical-style gallery at Burghley by 1562, one would expect equally high architectural aspirations for the courtyard that was to be such a showpiece by the completion of his building. It was the core of the house and the approach to the principal entrance into the great hall and the interior beyond. Again Dingley Hall, where the queen was to pay a brief visit on her progress of 1566, already had a glamorous courtyard porch, dated 1558 which sported French-influenced classical features (Fig 3.3).⁶¹

The arcades to either side of the clock-tower porch depicted in John Haynes 1755 view of Burghley are considerably more sophisticated and assured than the work at Dingley (Fig A.6e). But they are in very much the same idiom as the arcades which surrounded Thomas Gresham's Royal Exchange where building began in 1566, and which in turn so closely resembled the Antwerp Bourse, in the so-called "severe Renaissance style" (Fig 2.2).⁶² Much of Gresham's architecture was of course imported from Flanders where it was constructed under the direction of Henrick van Paesschen, who also did work for Cecil, and was very probably the mason whom Clough was instructing for the gallery.⁶³

There is no evidence of anything but local stone surviving in the courtyard at Burghley, but the three-bay arcaded loggias to either side of the frontispiece at the eastern end of the courtyard were replaced in 1828-33 by Gandy Deering's corridor, which has two glazed bays to either side. It seems very probable that the former arrangement did originally constitute the gallery from Flanders sited to either side of a new or re-modelled porch. Girouard's identification of the imported gallery possibly with that as shown by Thorpe on the south front⁶⁴ is hard to reconcile with the fact that the "open gallery" with full entablature was recently completed in May 1562, and unlikely to have been replaced only in the year following.⁶⁵

Some work was going on in the courtyard at Burghley at the time of Clough's letter, for Kemp reported to Cecil on 10th January 1562/3 that there was one freemason hired by the year working on two windows in the courtyard and more work was obviously in the pipeline because Kemp emphasized he "must have one or ij other to Reyse freston".⁶⁶ Although stone would not have been needed for an imported gallery itself, Edmund Hall's report in August of the following year (1564) indicates that a good deal of work on formal chambers grouped around the hall was well in hand.⁶⁷

Hall advised Cecil that he agreed with his "determinacon" that the stairs into the chapel should be modified, which would make a difference of only 2ft 6ins (0.78m) in the "nether" end of the chapel. Cecil's suggestion for altering the chapel stairs had implications for the "chamber" where the proportions would be affected by the change. One can infer from the report that as a result the stairs would have projected into, or further into, this chamber; or that a "half-pace" (in this case, hallway)⁶⁸ would have had to be enlarged to take the extra stairs, thus reducing the length of the chamber. "The chamber", therefore, must have been at the other end of the stairs, so either on a level above or below the chapel. Due to this reduction in length at one end of the chamber, at what was, presumably, the other end, therefore, Hall suggests scrapping the plan for a "half-pace" (again here meaning hallway) between the chamber and the hall - gaining an extra 4 ft 6 ins (1.37m) - and replacing it with a "Portal" (interior porch) to "rise before the door" which on its other side "passe cleane thorough to the maine wall of the hall".⁶⁹ The portal would still have to project 4 ft 6ins into the chamber, which strongly suggests that it had to accommodate a change in level. Including the thickness of the wall, this would allow for some six or seven steps of 6 ins or 7 ins rise - in all a level change of between three and four feet between the rooms (see Plan 13).

If the great hall was in the area occupied by T/049, T/042 and T/050 on Thorpe's plan, then the chamber leading from it to the south must have been in the area of the stair

chamber, T/014. There must have been a change of level downwards somewhere here which is not expressed on Thorpe's plan, for the room is contiguous both with the higher level of the later (existing) great hall (T/012) and also has doorways leading to the lower level courtyard and south-facing loggia (T/052).⁷⁰ As the arrangement stands today the stairs downward to this level occur towards the east end of the area (041). This would accord with a level change between the earlier great hall in 1564 and the chamber.⁷¹

In Edmund Hall's opinion a well fashioned "portal risinge in the midst of yor chamber" would "bewtifie" it and serve well the rooms on either side.⁷² It would look even better, he acknowledged, if placed in the corner of the chamber. But this was not practical because: "... on the East side of yor chamber it can not stande, because the dore wold spoile the side of the hall, where the longe borde shoulde stande."⁷³

As mentioned above, the 'main' wall of the hall, as opposed to the 'side' wall, implies the head of the room, behind the dais. If the hall and furniture were those of 1556, then the long board or side table was only 3 ft shorter than the dais and would have stood in the way of an imposing doorway at right angles to it in the south-east corner of the dais. It could not have stood easily on either wall below the dais, if, as Cecil's sketch suggests, there was a fireplace on one side and bay window on the other and where there was only room for a "little" table in 1556. (Plan 18).

If the portal was sited in the west corner of the chamber, on the other hand, Hall explained:

"it will take half the windowe in the chamber, w^{ch} may be borne, but the dore standinge against the end of the high table in the hall, will pester yor dore, except youe do apoint the shorter table to serve that place."⁷⁴

We have established that in 1556 the parlour door led off the dais on one of the long sides of the hall, and this must be the opening that would 'pester' the portal if it were in the south-west corner of the hall. The conjectural plan of the hall and furniture gives a clearer idea of the difficulties arising from placing the door in this corner, in relationship to the parlour door and the high table (Plan 15). A door leading from the centre of the dais end of the hall would be very unusual, but from Hall's description, it was to be more of a feature on the "chamber" side and here too a central door as he was proposing would be quite out of the ordinary. It is interesting that Hall's perception was that a central door was less pleasing aesthetically. From the plans examined in Thorpe's Book of Architecture it would appear that this was a widely shared belief.⁷⁵ Centrally opening entrance-ways from the exterior are quite common in these plans. Once inside, however, doorways opening centrally into any room are extremely rare. I can find only eight plans on which they feature at all, and in most cases only one internal doorway thus disposed.⁷⁶ Obviously, from a practical point of view, this arrangement causes fewer draughts, but in larger houses in particular, where processional ceremonial would be expected from one state room to another, it is still surprising. The later positioning of a centrally placed 'portal' as the introduction to the state rooms on the first floor at Burghley indicates that Cecil appreciated such an arrangement as an imposing transition point from one chamber to another (see Plan F2 T/114).⁷⁷ In the event, if the windows shown on Thorpe are in the position as built, Hall's proposal for the earlier portal seems not to have finally been chosen. Window W/T012/10 overlaps the south end wall of the hall. This suggests that instead, the passage from hall to chamber was effected on this east side of the dais wall, and possibly, like the three-light windows specified for the "entry" and the "stair" for the south range in the Masons' Schedule, an internal porch way projecting on either side of the wall containing the stairs down to the chamber may have had "light evenly spread" supplied from this window.⁷⁸

One imagines that Hall had in mind something similar to the ornate corner porch that now stands in the 'Oak Room' at Broughton Castle or to that at Sizergh Castle, which

would create a fitting passage from this chamber to the hall, and could contain a change of level (Fig. 3.4). An example of a rather simpler enclosed entrance leading from great hall to parlour still exists at the dais end of the great hall at Haddon Hall.

From the situation as described in the earlier correspondence, one would expect that the parlour, the door to which must have led off the hall dais on the west side, would have abutted the west wall of the "chamber" (there must have been a short flight of steps down to the parlour beyond the door leading from the hall as it similarly would have been at the lower level). If this was the case, the chamber's unimportant window that Hall felt it would not be amiss to overrule, would have been an internal window, as one finds quite frequently in sixteenth-century architecture,⁷⁹ and, indeed are shown by Thorpe at Burghley. The alternative possibility is of an alleyway or passage between the two walls, as Kemp's description of the position of the quarry "sited at the door that leadeth through by the parlour door into the garden" seems to suggest.⁸⁰ As this would have been in the area where the peculiarity of the change of direction in the wall-line of the courtyard occurs (marked A on Plan 3b), the parlour could have formed part of a pre-existing structure on the south side, that might originally have been detached from the east hall range (see Plan 13).⁸¹

Nowhere in Hall's report is the "chamber" off the great hall referred to as the "great chamber", a room that developed from the medieval solar and, throughout its history, was invariably on the first floor. Hall is much more likely to have been alluding to a dining or great parlour, which would be in the conventional position, and again recommended by Boorde "under such a fasshyon that the parler be annexed to the heade of the hall".⁸² This would be in line with the general aggrandizement and increased standard of comfort of private accommodation that Cecil was introducing, probably to provide a higher status room as an addition to the existing parlour which stood to the west of it. Longleat, for instance, had three parlours leading off the dais end of the hall by the

completion of Thynne's building.⁸³ Even in quite small manor houses, more than one parlour at the high end of the hall was quite common by the early seventeenth century.⁸⁴

On the plan in the Hatfield collection endorsed by Cecil "the first Grond platt of Theobalds" showing ideas for improving the accommodation at the old house which came with the property, the great parlour leads off the dais end of the hall by way of a half-pace containing a stair (Plan 17).⁸⁵ Almost certainly an intended addition by Cecil, the parlour is nearly the size of the great hall itself. Cecil must have had the plan drawn up not long before Edmund Hall was writing to him about Burghley, and it seems logical that his ideas on planning would have been developing along similar lines in both places. The new house at Theobalds would also have a substantial great parlour leading off the hall via one end of the stair chamber to the great chamber above (Plan 19). On its far side was a half-pace containing the short flight of stairs to the chapel, similar in position in fact to the arrangement inferred at Burghley at this stage.

Elsewhere at Theobalds there was a north parlour and another parlour, probably a winter parlour, between the hall and the kitchen in an equivalent relationship with these rooms as the "little parlour" at Burghley, detailed below. All of these are variations on the conventional disposition of the major and lesser reception rooms of houses of the period, and there seems no reason for Cecil to have deviated from the pattern at Burghley by having a great chamber on the ground floor. The implications of Hall's letter are that the ground-floor chamber was a new addition to the house being added to the existing hall, which means that a chapel above, for which the "high window" specified in the Mason's Schedule was destined⁸⁶ may have been moved or extended eastwards to stand beyond the south end of the double-height hall (see Plan 20).

At the other end of the great hall the variable levels of the ground floor between kitchen and hall would account for the problems reported by Norris and then by Kemp in reconciling floor levels of the "flores over" in the area round the dry larder and the pantry.

The level change between the existing great hall and great kitchen in the outer width of the east range now takes place just south of the kitchen between O38 and O39. When Thorpe drew up his plan, however, it was effected further to the south (T/011). There are two flights of three steps in the thickness of the walls to either side of T/011. Thirteen stairs descending south to north are hidden under a flap showing stairs rising westward to the first floor.⁸⁷

No equivalent level changes north to south by means of stairs are shown by Thorpe in the courtyard width of the east range. The problem has been ingeniously by-passed because the rooms do not interconnect in this direction. However, T/048 is shown as at the same level as the great kitchen (T/002); T/049 has a foot in both camps, with stairs running east west in its midst; T/042 and T/050 are shown at the same level as the later (existing) great hall (T/012).⁸⁸ The present great hall floor level, though it is so much higher than that of the great kitchen to the north, and of the south range to the west, is nevertheless only slightly above the exterior ground level on its east side.⁸⁹

Under part, at least, of the northern half of the courtyard width of the east range, (under the area O48 and O40, & see Plan 21) it is evident from the existing fabric of the house there was once a cellar floor at a level approximately 4 ft (1.3 m) above that of the existing cellar floor level. This means it will have been only approximately 3 ft 3 ins (1m) below the existing great kitchen level. A store cupboard contained within the thickness of the wall, set at an oddly oblique angle through the wall can be seen in the RCHM plan, opening off the west side of O38 (Marked E on Plan 3a). Immediately to the south of this in the cellars there is a stone stair set at a parallel angle through the wall which leads from a now blocked opening in O38 into the cellar where its lowest step terminates at this level (i.e. 4 ft 1.3 m) above the existing cellar floor) (Fig 3.5). This is set within what must have been the outer wall of the east range (c.4ft 9ins / 1.5m thick allowing for the blocking). It had a door at its head, indicated by hinge posts in the wall on the south side, so possibly it gave access into a subsidiary service court, discussed below (the rise of the

stairs would bring this to the level of the existing great kitchen floor, (002)). There is also a square-headed stone doorway set on the same level as the foot of the stair (i.e. 4 ft above the existing cellar floor) in a wall running east/west just north of the area under the 'Saloon' (see Plan 21). The floor of the 'Saloon' (049), meanwhile has been lowered at some point so that the head of this doorway is now above the level of this floor.

A floor at the higher level - i.e. the level of the foot of this doorway - would have been more of a basement than a cellar. This intermediate level must pre-date the present cellar floor level and most probably constituted the kitchen offices in Cecil's father's house. As the larder/pantry/stairs were being newly constructed with timber partitioning in 1556 then this would seem to be the most likely time for the basement to have been further excavated to the present cellar floor level, with the new offices housed on the floor above. This would still have been on a lower level than the great hall and would also agree with the stairs shown on Cecil's sketch, if these led downwards just north of the hall (See Plan 13).

Returning to the ground floor directly to the north of this area, the floor level of the "Hog's Hall" (001, and T/001 on Thorpe) is now the same as that of the north range into which it leads. Formerly its floor level was the same as that of the present great kitchen, evident from a large hearth on its east wall (now concealed within a cupboard) of which the present floor obscures the lower half. The hearth is 6 ft 9 ins (2.1m) across with an oven in the wall on its northern side (Fig 3.7). A hinge post on the north wall of the stairs that now lead from 001 down to the great kitchen (002) indicates there was a door in the passage between the two at the former level.

By the time Thorpe made his survey, T/001 was already shown at the higher level, with steps leading down to the great kitchen, as is the case today. This area (T/001), where cooking obviously took place, must, therefore, have been part of the earlier complex of the 1550s-60s which in turn probably superseded the form of Richard Cecil's house in this area. The hearth in 001 would have backed onto the hearth of the main timber-roofed

kitchen of the 1550s-60s which must have been located in this corner of the house, with the dry larder and pantry, and probably the "little parlour" in between it and the great hall.⁹⁰

The "Hog's Hall" may originally have been the pastry kitchen. At Theobalds in John Thorpe's plan of the cellars, where the domestic offices were housed, the "pastry" is shown next to "ye great kytchen" in an equivalent manner.⁹¹ The whole arrangement of this area at Burghley appears, again, to be very much as suggested by Boorde:

"And the buttry and the pantry be at the lower ende of the hall, the seller under the pantry, sette somewhat abase; the kychen set somewhat a base from the buttry and pantry, commyng with an entry by the wall of the buttry, the pastry howse and the larder-howse anexed to the kytchen".⁹²

Mildred Cecil's apartments were also in this area of the house, where floor levels were causing problems for the builders. In his letter of 18 October 1561, Kemp advised Cecil:

"I thynck it good to lay the flore over the pantre somewhat hegher than the flore of my ladyes chamber, for when yo shall inlaye the lytle parlar as yo must nedes then of necessitie yo must reyse y^t flore"⁹³

This "lytle parlar" at the service end of the hall must be the same as the "parlour" that Norris was referring to in May 1556 when he reported a discrepancy of six inches between the new floors and that of (or over) the parlour, and of ten inches to that of the "new gallery".⁹⁴ It appears as if "my ladyes chamber" was in fact on the floor above the little parlour, and that the floor of this parlour does refer to the floor "over" the room, in which case the differing levels above would be made less significant when it was "inlaye[d]".

As "My ladyes chamber" was close to the area above the pantry one can assume that the other 'female' accommodation reserved for Mildred Cecil will have been situated at this end of the house, in the northern half of the east range, and possibly extending into the eastern end of the north range. (See Plan 20).⁹⁵ As Alberti advised, "the Mistress of the Family should have an Apartment in which she may easily hear everything that is done in the House".⁹⁶ Bess of Hardwick's accommodation at Chatsworth, for instance, was in a similar position to Mildred Cecil's above the kitchen offices, and there was also an adjacent gallery (see Plan 14b).⁹⁷

Like Bess's suite, Mildred Cecil's accommodation appears to have been quite grand. Cecil refers specifically to female accommodation in his Memorial. Under the heading for the rough masons, he noted "to apoynt ye Jacks for ye mayd chamber". Jacks (lavatories) for the servant's "abode" were itemised separately, so the "mayd" or maids must have been of a higher status, as one might expect for personal attendants for Mildred Cecil meriting their own room and wardrobe. More importantly, under the mason's work in the Memorial, Cecil also listed "to make upp ye dore into my wiffs gallery". Almost certainly this alluded to the "new gallery" mentioned by Norris that led off a room that was over the kitchen offices, and so close to "My ladyes chamber" as detailed by Abraham.

Not surprisingly, in view of the attention being given to her own private area of the house, a letter written to Cecil by Thomas Parry shows that Mildred was taking an interest in what was going on there at this time, even though she was based principally in London and at the property they leased in Wimbledon. Cecil had stayed at Burghley on his way to negotiate peace terms with the French in Scotland in June 1560, sending a message to Mildred via Parry who replied that Lady Cecil would be pleased "to hear of Burghleigh" from him.⁹⁸ In August of the following year Gresham wrote to Cecil trusting that "my Lady your wyves chairs Spanish and velvet will be here shortly"⁹⁹ which may have been intended for her suite at Burghley.

"My wiffes gallery" certainly implies a house of considerable pretension, taking as its models royal houses with gender specific galleries in the private apartments, such as the queen's gallery at Hampton Court and at Whitehall, both built in the 1530s. This is a very early date, however, for a gallery to be included in the private female accommodation of a non-royal household. I can find no other references to such a phenomenon before or close to this time.¹⁰⁰ "Gallery" of course could signify any number of different structures in the sixteenth century from a simple overhang to a long gallery occupying the floor area of an entire range.¹⁰¹ All we know here is that it was important enough for a stone dressed door-way to be proposed for it, and if, as seems probable, it was the "new gallery" then a fairly large room.¹⁰² Again following royal precedent, it may have provided the link between Mildred's suite and that of her husband's.¹⁰³ Thorpe's ambitious plan for Buckhurst House (never executed) for the man who took over from Cecil as Lord Treasurer in 1599, is inscribed "the gallerye over these lodgings/for ye lady syde" and, on the opposite side of the house the gallerye over these lodgings/for my Lo: syde".¹⁰⁴ Summerson suggests a probable date of c.1599 for the proposal plan for the house. Furthermore he notes a number of similarities between it and "Burghley as completed in 1585 - a model which Lord Burghley's successor in office would hardly fail to consult."¹⁰⁵ (Plan 22). Thomas Sackville, who was created first Lord Buckhurst in 1567, was an able poet, scholar and writer and close friend of Thomas Hoby. He was made an M.A. during the entertainment of the queen by Cambridge University at Audley End in 1571, an event masterminded by Cecil, and a Privy Councillor shortly afterwards. He may well have known of Burghley House and the accommodation provided for its equally learned and cultivated mistress well before 1585.¹⁰⁶

The now hidden three-light window, first noted by Gotch is also within the vicinity of Mildred's suite (Plan 3c). The west (interior) facing wall on the southern side of the window, now masked behind the east wall of the 'Saloon' (049) shows no scars to indicate there was ever an intervening floor, as one would expect at some point from this first-floor height.¹⁰⁷ Could this window possibly be a three-light window for a high-

status stairway or half-pace lobby to a stair leading to Mildred's accommodation, like those specified by Cecil in the Mason's Schedule for the "stair" and "entry" in the south range?¹⁰⁸ Cecil attached considerable value to stairways, and a well appointed stair leading to his wife's suite would have provided a fitting passage to her accommodation from the more public area of the low end of the hall. Again this was the arrangement at Chatsworth (Plan 14). The surviving painted wall decoration that surrounds the window with its "anticke" arabesque pattern, and the fragment of a stylized flower and foliage design contained within a framework of trompe l'oeil architecture, suggest a fairly sophisticated French-influenced Renaissance scheme which, like the French window architecture, would be compatible with this phase of the building history (Fig 3.8).

Painted decoration on a stairway would be unusual; that of the great staircase at Knole, again work for Thomas Sackville, Lord Buckhurst, between 1605 and 1608 is probably the most famous. The arabesque motif used at Burghley is similar to another sample of painted distemper decoration which has survived in the south range of the house (Fig. 3.9). This dates from Cecil's later building period, but the motif can also be compared with inlaid decoration such as that on an oak bed-head, probably made for Henry VIII and Anne of Cleves (Fig. 3.10). The border mimicking architectural mouldings on the other hand, is nearer in intention to those around the narrative scenes in the wall paintings of the first-floor apartments at Hill Hall which probably date from the late 1570s (Fig.3.11b). However, as it was clearly an outside window it must date from the first phase, and as the area where it is located became less important in Cecil's later development of the house, it seems fairly certain that its decoration too dates from this first building phase.

In 1551 Cecil, as discussed above, had been involved in settling a dispute between Sir Thomas Cawarden, Master of the Revels and the Surveyor of the King's Works over accounts for the banqueting house being erected as a hunting stand in Hyde Park. Cawarden was in charge of the top teams of painters, including the Italian, Toto di

Nunziata, who were working on this prestigious little building designed for entertaining an embassy from France.¹⁰⁹ Cecil must have seen the work in order to judge the work done by either side. The manner of trompe l'oeil design used at Burghley was exactly the sort of virtuoso illusionistic architectural decoration favoured for these lavish temporary structures that were in themselves fictive evocations of 'real' architecture. Cawarden obviously took advantage of connections made through the Revels Office and used Italian court painters to decorate his house at Whitefriars in London.¹¹⁰ Cecil may equally have been introducing the latest courtly style of interior decoration which he was experiencing in London, to embellish his wife's suite at Burghley. The quality of the work is not outstanding and there are no records of any well-known craftsmen working at Burghley, but Cecil might have employed one of the cheaper less well-known painters retained by the Office of Works or, as with the stonework, introduced new idioms to local craftsmen. A surviving painted plaster wall dating from the sixteenth century in a house in Stamford, has a pattern of flowers contained within polygonal medallion frames, suggesting there were local painters of some ability in the immediate vicinity, whose skills may originally have been stimulated by work available at Burghley House (Fig. 3.12).

There is also mention of a nursery in Cecil's Memorial. This must have been in the same area as the bakehouse because he refers to a "way" which will lead to them both. He also lists a floor over the chamber (i.e. a ceiling) which is over the bakehouse, so we must be in the same area as Norris was writing of in 1556 where it is clear that the chamber over the "bakhowse" was near the new gallery and the little parlour and, therefore, in the neighbourhood of Mildred's suite.¹¹¹

The nurture and education of the children were the responsibilities of the household that were directly under Mildred's control - a "matchless mother" and "zealous and excellent tutor" as Cecil eulogised her in his precepts to their son, Robert, in the 1580s.¹¹² Following the birth of their daughter, Anne, in December 1556, Sir Philip Hoby wrote to Cecil in the January asking him to stay, pressurising Cecil with the taunt that he "can make

no step without the licence of my Lady"¹¹³ who did not want to leave the child. Mildred's reluctance to abandon her new-born daughter to stay with the Hobys is understandable. She had already given birth to two children who had died shortly afterwards, and a third, who only lived for a few days, was to be born in 1560. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the nursery wing in proximity to her own quarters where she could have kept close contact with the children. The reference to a "way" leading to the nursery and the "bakehouse" implies that the nursery was built out over domestic offices in a subsidiary wing or court at this end of the house - most probably behind the northern end of the east range - as Cecil's sketch plan of the hall suggests existed (Plan 18). In 1566 when the queen's visit to Burghley was diverted to Stamford because the same daughter, Anne, had contracted smallpox, the French ambassador's representative reported to him that the child "couchant en un petit cors de logis assès esloigné du grands cors",¹¹⁴ which tends to support this theory.

The only other reference which may be relevant to Mildred's living quarters is Kemp's report to Cecil on 18 October 1561, the same letter that referred to "my Ladyes chamber": "the Range wall to the Courte is up to the flore the cornar stones of the turret yt maketh the square is layde, the east syde wall is at the Walke in the gutter & the lead layd therof".¹¹⁵ If Mildred's accommodation spanned the north-east corner of the house, then the only means of getting to the chapel to the south of the great hall would have been downstairs and through the hall itself, unless this could be by-passed by a "walke" at first-floor level, pre-dating the walk that was to be constructed over the classical loggia. Cecil was to introduce the same sort of plan at Theobalds to overcome the difficulty of circumventing a double height hall.¹¹⁶ The arrangement at Burghley by the end of his building programme fulfilled a somewhat similar purpose, but in reverse, where the lead walk above the courtyard loggia gave access from the south stairway and the great chamber to the chapel, which by then was at the northern end of the east range.

Mildred was as pious as she was learned, and the Cecil household at Wimbledon retained a priest and maintained the traditional discipline of assembly of the whole household twice daily for prayers. Despite her strong Protestant beliefs, the rituals of the chapel appear to have played an important part in the routine of the house, and one would expect provision for a similar regime at Burghley, and for Mildred to have had access to the chapel other than by the public route through the hall.

The logical position for Cecil's accommodation must be in the north range on the "working" side of the house. From here, when in residence, he could have overseen the court of husbandry that he was developing at the north-west corner of the house in the early 1560s. The north range would also be the most plausible location for any offices reserved for dealing with the administration of the estate. The inside domestic offices in the north-east would also have been within easy reach, and as Cecil's accounts for the household at Wimbledon show,¹¹⁷ it was he who took control of provisioning and planning of detailed domestic management, as it was customary in the sixteenth century for the (usually male) principal householder to do. Advisory literature - such as Boorde's popular manual and the numerous formal household regulations available from the period - were invariably drawn up by, as well as addressed to men.¹¹⁸

Blocked windows in the plinth of the north front indicate that at some stage the cellars under this range were, like Longleat, also expressed as a basement storey, (as is still the case with the lower-set windows under the entrance frontispiece, and in the stairs to the cellar Fig. 3.13). If there was external access to these cellars at the western end, they would have provided an important internal conduit and storage area linking the husbandry court with the domestic offices surrounding the kitchen. An existing stairway leading off the north-west corner of 001 (see Plan 23), gives direct access to the cellars under the north range, which do not connect underground with the cellars under the east range.

In the north range cellars there is a now blocked window facing north in the internal wall on the south side of this stairway (position marked F on Plan 23). This is on the same wall-line as another window, now also internal, (marked F in 037 on Plan 3a). It is possible, therefore, that the wall into which these two windows are set represents the original external north wall of Cecil's father's house. If this is so then as the initial development of the 'Hog's Hall' (001) with its lower floor had already been superseded by the time Thorpe made his plan, and as it lies beyond this wall line, and within the body of the existing north front, it seems reasonable to place this as part of phase one of Cecil's building when he was undertaking so much work on the whole complex of kitchen offices.

An archway on a north/south axis at the east end of the cellar under the north frontispiece (marked G on Plan 23) has also been superseded by the surrounding stonework which forms the foundation of the frontispiece above. This pre-existing structure suggests that there was a cellar projecting northwards from the main body of the north range at this point, prior to the construction of the existing frontispiece, dated 1587 on its crest. The implication, therefore, suggests that in Cecil's first building campaign he extended his father's building northwards creating the lower stages at least of the existing north front, and that there was also some sort of further projection around the central point of the new front approximating to the position of the later, present, north frontispiece.¹¹⁹

From the wording of Kemp's letter of October 1561 the most likely position for the "turret yt maketh the square" is in one of the angles at the east end of the courtyard. The turret completed for Thomas Hoby at Bisham in the previous year is contained within the main body of the house, which it rises above.¹²⁰ The denotative value of a tower had by this time transferred from that of defence look-out, to that of pleasing prospect, while retaining the seemingly irresistible status of height. Sharington's tower at Lacock, its lavish architectural furnishing indicating its superior status, is the most famous surviving example. But of Cecil's other associates, Nicholas Bacon had an octagonal tower over the doorway at Redgrave, completed by March 1556 when Cecil and he visited the house

before they moved on to Burghley.¹²¹ Nearer at hand, Sir Edward Griffin, built a tower at Dingley, almost certainly in the late 1550s or early 1560s, even though the core of his house was already formed round an original five storey medieval tower house.¹²² Cecil would no doubt have wanted to include a feature to vie with these fashionable ivory towers. At Theobalds one of the tower rooms was to be reserved for storing "Evidences", the increasing body of records it was becoming necessary and important to safeguard to provide the new legal, rather than physical security needed to protect one's family name and property.¹²³ The lower cabinet of Sharrington's tower was a muniment or strong room.¹²⁴ Cecil, as is abundantly clear from the wealth of his surviving state and private papers, kept copious records. In 1605 Thomas Cecil was to send for "evidences" at Burghley "proving" the status of his ancestry.¹²⁵ Cecil would almost certainly have had space somewhere in the house dedicated to this purpose, and a tower in the region of his own accommodation in one of the north angles of the courtyard, with a stair leading to it contained within the tower below, as at Bisham, would have provided an ideal situation.

The position of a feature such as the turret has to remain tentative. What can confidently be claimed from this conjectural reconstruction is that Cecil had developed a substantial mansion which, by 1566, would have constituted an important but not overly-magnificent courtyard house with all its principal features in their familiar positions. Dynastic continuity was almost certainly emphasized in the building by the incorporation of the 'old' inherited house into the new plan. But at the same time Cecil was synthesising a number of innovative architectural ideas into a more architecturally unified plan, incorporating guest accommodation, than is evident from earlier houses in England. He had also upgraded the standard of accommodation to 'luxury class', pointing the way for subsequent courtier houses.

The first phase of Cecil's building at Burghley signals significant developments in the new medium of non-military socio-political architecture through which, increasingly, individual courtiers could demonstrate and exercise their power. In the following chapter

Cecil's simultaneous and closely related development of the gardens immediately surrounding the house and the creation of a hunting park beyond, which are in line with this policy, will be examined. So too will aspects of the services installed to support the whole enterprise.

Although the house was to undergo a second major redevelopment by Cecil in the 1570s and 80s, he established the fundamental matrix of his final plan for the house and its environs in this first campaign. It would already have presented an attractive package of comfort, style and amenities to the queen and court for the proposed visit in the summer of 1566.

-
- 1 Howard 1987, 78, and for example Minster Lovell Hall in the fifteenth century
(plan in Wood 1985, 57)
 - 2 Girouard 1963, 23-25. Girouard proposes a date between 1577 and 1587, but as
discussed in the next chapter, circumstantial evidence suggests a date earlier in
the 1570s
 - 3 The original wall faces were revealed during repair work to the chimneys on the
roof of 150. The discovery is not included in Alan Wilson's record of association.
The information is based on empirical observation only. The window itself was
inaccessible and the angle of view was directly from above and so dimensions
were difficult to gauge and only estimated by sight, no measurements being taken.
(Information from Alan Wilson)
 - 4 Boorde 1542 Ch.III, Furnivall Ed. 1870, 238. One can take "prospecte" in this
instance to mean access.
 - 5 Appendix B, 1 ln.11
 - 6 Girouard 1973, 1669
 - 7 Hayes & Murdin 1740-1759, 747; Translation of the Latin original of William
Cecil's diaries from Hatfield MSS Vol. 2
 - 8 Appendix B, 1, lns.15-16
 - 9 Appendix A, 2, lns 2, 20 & 18
 - 10 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol. 3 f.118
 - 11 Appendix B, 1, ln.10
 - 12 See below for references to rooms over the pantry
 - 13 Appendix A, 2, ln.16/17
 - 14 "Sesterne" most probably refers to the village of Sewstern, Leics, from where there
was an ancient drove road to Stamford, (Hoskins, 145 & VCH Leicester Vol 3, 67.)
The geological map in VCH (p128) shows it as an area of Northamptonshire Sands
and Lincolnshire Limestone, so an area which can readily produce limestone. (
Information supplied by Doreen Agutter)
 - 15 Exeter MSS E/57/7
 - 16 Appendix B, 1, lns.11-12.
 - 17 Clifton-Taylor 1987, 352 quoting John Speed's Theatre of the Empire of Great
Britain
 - 18 Hatfield MSS HMC Salisbury Vol I, no 502. This letter, which was not transcribed
by Gotch with those from the State Papers, gives valuable extra clues as to the
dimensions of the hall
 - 19 Appendix A, 3 ln. 16
 - 20 Appendix A, 2, lns. 33-34
 - 21 The word half-pace was also used to denote a hallway or lobby. See Appendix A, 9.
In both cases the context makes it clear as to which is meant.
 - 22 Girouard 1959, 202
 - 23 Appendix A, 4, ln. 6
 - 24 SP Dom. 12/21/47
 - 25 Part of the heading for the range in Appendix B, 3
 - 26 Although Thorpe's plan, as discussed above, contracts the range north to south
compared with the built dimensions, the present great hall is represented
accurately, and so the rooms immediately to the west of it can reasonably be taken
as equally so.
 - 27 See Wood 1985, 32-35
 - 28 Appendix A, 9, lns. 6-21

-
- 29 This is discussed in more detail below
- 30 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 118 inc f. 17, 40 & 96 (some sheets of the MSS are not numbered)
- 31 See Starkey 1993, 7-20; Thurley 1993, 113-114
- 32 Thurley 1993, 114-120
- 33 Tytler 1839 Vol 2, 111
- 34 Peck Ed. Evans 1732-1735, Vol 1, Lib 1 Ch 1, 2
- 35 Allowing for a width of c.8ft (2.7m) for the screens passage, (including the thickness of screen) at Burghley this means the hall size is reasonable when compared to houses in the 'Cecil Circle' where new halls were built in the 1560s. (See Girouard 1963, 23 for list of hall sizes). Penshurst and Bisham, of course, already had very large medieval halls.
- 36 See Chapter 6
- 37 Hatfield MSS 143/27 & 28
- 38 Friedman 1989, 38; Middleton collection, University of Nottingham, MI LM 128-129
- 39 Appendix B, 4 Sheet 2
- 40 Howard 1987, 49-50
- 41 Cal SP Dom. 12/ 85/49
- 42 King's Works Vol 3, 30
- 43 Cal SP Dom. 12/181/42; Printed in Gents. Mag. Vol CVI, i, 149
- 44 SP Dom 12/193/28 Cecil to Walsingham, 10 Sept 1586
- 45 See Hatfield MSS Vol 143 29 & 30 and 143/24 (Plans 16 & 17)
- 46 Gotch in Eds Jack & Jack 1904, 46
- 47 Further implications of the position of this window are discussed below
- 48 Appendix A, 3, ln.14
- 49 Hussey 1953, 1831; Girouard 1963, 25
- 50 One of the items in a contract of 1537/8 for carpenters' work at Hengrave Hall for example is for "ye hall of ye same lodging to be seelyd at ye daysee xv foote of heyghte...and ye rest of ye hall to be seelyd to ye heyght of ye windows".(Document printed in Salzman 1992, Appendix B, 122, 582)
- 51 Appendix A, 2 ln. 17
- 52 Summerson 1959, 117-118; Parl. Survey 1650, PRO 3317/Herts/26, f.9
- 53 SP Dom. 12/21/4
- 54 It is unlikely that Kemp would have sent such an informal piece of information unacknowledged to his master. Examples of Cecil putting his immediate thoughts on paper in this way survive in the Hatfield collection. (Hatfield MSS Vol 143/44,/45 &/37,38 for comparison and freehand sketches on the margins or verso of more formal plans; also thumb-nail sketch on the title page of his scheme for the great chamber at Theobalds in 1588 (Lansdowne MSS Vol 104 f.24). A plan, possibly drawn by Francis Willoughby, describing the basic plan to be adopted for Wollaton, is sketched on the back of a sixteenth-century genealogy in a similar way (Friedman 1989, 36)
- 55 On a letter from Kemp in 1573 in which he informs Cecil that his mother needs a new dress and wishes to have a priest at Burghley, Cecil has noted at the bottom of the page "A gown - A minister from Cambridge for Burghley" obviously as a reminder of action to be taken on its contents. (HMC Salisbury Vol 2, No 133)
- 56 Hatfield MSS Maps 2, 9 &10
- 57 This is discussed below
- 58 The date of this room is discussed more fully in chapter 5

-
- 59 Cal SP Foreign 1563, No 182, Clough to Cecil, Jan 28 1563
- 60 See previous Chapter (2) SP Dom 12/20/43
- 61 RCHME unpublished report Dingley NBR File 61862, 2
- 62 This term was quoted to me in a letter from Dr Krista De Jonge, Professor in the history of architecture, University of Leuven, who has kindly pointed out to me some of the avante-garde Franco-Italian-influenced architecture which Cecil might have experienced on his visit to the Netherlands in 1555. This includes work by Jacques du Broeucq, Mary of Hungary's court architect, Tommaso Vincidor at Breda and the unknown architect(s) of the gallery of the Granville Palace at Brussels (after 1551). Dr de Jonge's articles on de Broeucq are awaiting publication, as is her study of the Granville Palace. As she points out, "most of the literature needs updating" on this period of architecture in the Netherlands, but without doubt there was some very interesting Renaissance architecture, some of which Cecil must have seen on his trip, made just as he was starting his first phase of building at Burghley. (K. De Jonge dr. b. ir.arch. February 1 1995)
- 63 See Burgon 1889 Vol 2, 345- 355, 114-120 . Henryke, also known as Henrick von Pas (see Summerson 1980, 48)
- 64 Girouard 1992 pt 2, 60
- 65 Appendix A, 6 & A7, lns.16-18
- 66 Appendix A, 8, ln. 24
- 67 Appendix A, 9
- 68 See fn. 21
- 69 For identification of "portal" with "interior porch" see Girouard 1983, 45
- 70 This is discussed more fully with regard to Cecil's second building phase in Chapter 6
- 71 As Thorpe's plan shows the rooms here as they were differently disposed following the second phase of Cecil's development of the house the anomaly of the missing stairs is therefore analysed in Chapter 6.
- 72 Appendix A, 9, ln.11
- 73 Appendix A, 9, lns.14-16
- 74 Appendix A, 9, lns.17-19
- 75 Summerson 1966 passim
- 76 See Wood 1985, 129-134. No central doorways are cited, although occasionally they were positioned in the dais wall somewhat away from the angles. Doors placed thus are shown in Thorpe Sir John Soane's Museum, T99 (plan of unknown house), and T 221 (plan possibly associated with Theobalds, Summerson 1966,102)
- 77 This arrangement is analysed fully in Chapters 6 & 7
- 78 Quoted from Palladio Ed. Ware 1738 Bk 1 Ch. XXVIII, 34 as recommended for stairways, (see quotation used below in connection with the south stair chamber)
- 79 For example, those onto the great stairway at Hardwick Hall dating from the 1590s, or those overlooking the chapel at Hampton Court, in the manner Boorde appears to have recommended earlier in the century (Boorde Ed. Furnivall 1870, 238
- 80 SP Dom 12/21/47
- 81 A passageway which splits the south-east range of Slaugham Place is shown on John Thorpe's plan of the building (Summerson 1966, T239). There is also a change of level at this point in the range, and it too, may be due to an earlier building arrangement. (Girouard 1964, 72)
- 82 Boorde Ch.IV; Furnivall Ed. 1870, 238
- 83 Girouard 1980, 103

-
- 84 See Maguire and Gomme 1995, 59 & 60. Preston Court and Horton Court, for examples
- 85 Hatfield MSS 143/24;
- 86 Appendix B, 3
- 87 This detail cannot be seen on reproductions of Thorpe's plan.
- 88 Beneath the floors of the northern half of the east range, as it stands today, there is complex evidence of earlier building histories. Not even a schematic plan of the cellars, however, is available. It is to be hoped that RCHM will be able to undertake a measured survey, that will include sections, in the near future. Such an undertaking is beyond the scope of this thesis, but it would enable a far more precise understanding of the archaeology of the east range in particular, where the greatest number of alterations appear to have taken place and where the ground 'level' is so different above from east to west and from north to south. Measurements have been taken in key areas, to produce the sketch plans but access is restricted in some parts of the cellars, and furthermore the south and east cellars do not connect with those under the north range. The configuration of the cellars is so complex that accurate tabulation with the above ground structure is limited by using the resources available.
- 89 By 5ft (1.96m) and 4ft 6ins (1.36m) respectively
- 90 Evidence of masonry of a pre-existing structure to the east of 001 which had already been superseded by the time Thorpe made his plan is discussed in chapter 6
- 91 Plan no T243, Plate 112 in Summerson 1966
- 92 Boorde Ch. IV Ed Furnivall 1870, 238
- 93 Appendix A, 3, lns.15-18
- 94 Appendix B, 1, lns.13-14
- 95 There was a similar disposition of female accommodation adjacent to a gallery and over the kitchen offices at Chatsworth, as can be seen from Girouard's reconstruction of the plan as it was by the end of the sixteenth century. (Girouard 1973, 1669)
- 96 Alberti, Book V, Ch 17, Ed Leoni 1755, 107
- 97 Girouard 1973, 1669
- 98 HMC Salisbury Vol I, 766
- 99 Burgon 1839 Vol I, 94
- 100 I have consulted Rosalys Coope, who could not call to mind any such references but she kindly reminded me of the plan of Buckhurst
- 101 See Coope 1984, 446-55
- 102 This is further supported by it requiring 26 loads of plaster (see Appendix A,2 lns. 16-17)
- 103 King's Works IV, 17-20
- 104 Summerson 1966, 47, T 19 & 20
- 105 Summerson 1966, 47
- 106 DNB 1975, Entry for Thomas Sackville. for Cecil's involvement at Audley End, see Nichols 1823, 111-114
- 107 This was observed by Nicholas Cooper when we were inspecting the window
- 108 Appendix B, 3. "Entry" occurs inscribed on a number of Thorpe's plans and denotes a passageway (Summerson 1966, T63, T110, T136 etc., see 117
- 109 King's Works Vol IV, 157; HMC Salisbury Vol I, 92-93
- 110 Howard 1987, 126
- 111 Appendix B, 1
- 112 L. B. Wright 1964, 9

-
- 113 Hatfield MSS CP/151/140
- 114 PRO 31/3/26, Baschet Transcripts, de Vulcob to Bochetel, August 6th 1556. In his letter of 18 October 1561 Kemp sent the plan of the court of husbandry to Cecil explaining, "of the brewhowse as I thynck it wold do well & where I make ij rowmes for the bakehowse & mylne", (Appendix A,3) It is clear from the plan, however, that this bakehouse was quite independent of the house and must have been additional to that which was contiguous with the rooms within the house. Certainly there is no mention of a "nursery" in Cecil's list for the court of husbandry in his Memorial (Appendix A,3 & Appendix B,4)
- 115 Appendix A, 3, lns.5-8
- 116 Summerson 1959, 177
- 117 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 118, f. 40,17,36
- 118 Heal 1984, 69
- 119 I am grateful to Tony Baggs for observing this archaeological evidence in the cellar under the frontispiece. Further evidence that the lower stories of the house in the north range pre-existed the later building phase is discussed in Chapter 6.
- 120 Thomas Hoby in Ed. Powell 1902, 129
- 121 Sandeen 1959, 93
- 122 Binney 1980, 1990-3
- 123 See for example Henry IV Pt 1 Act 3 Sc 1 using John of Gaunt as mouthpiece. He laments there is no longer the certainty that to be a gentleman is a self-evident state, it must be backed by evidence from the "inky blots and rotten parchment bonds" of legal documents by which the land is now portioned out
- 124 Burnett-Brown 1986, 12
- 125 The occasion was when his half-brother Robert was accused of being the grandson of a "sievemaker" Thomas sent for a search through his "evidences at Burghley" proving that his great-grandfather had been addressed as "esquire" at a time when the name meant what it said (HMC Salisbury MSS Vol 13)

CHAPTER FOUR : GARDEN AND ESTATE: THE POLITICS OF PLEASURE

When Baron Waldstein wrote up his account of his visit to Burghley in July 1600 he recalled

".....the mansion which is built of square-cut stone is very splendid; the drive which leads up to the main entrance is an unusually long one and great care has been taken to choose the best sites for planting the trees on either side of it. There is an extremely rich garden, completely surrounded by a wall; beyond it, at the entrance to the mansion, there is a really fine fish-pond.....In one of the rooms there is a chimney-piece made of the purest marble; it is not unlike a looking-glass, and by natural reflection you can see the neighbouring countryside in it quite clearly when the windows are open - fields trees, and towers as well."¹

Clearly, Waldstein did not judge the house in isolation from its surroundings. Nor is their status overlooked in Camden's tribute to Cecil's Northamptonshire estate:

"the great Pillar of Britain....received lustre from his virtues, as well as added magnificence from the building he erected there and the park for deer enclosed by a stone wall of great extent"²

The well-known portrait of Cecil on his mule provides evidence of an unusual appreciation, within the pictorial conventions of the period, of the value of 'natural' landscape as the ideal setting for constructing a specific political image (Fig.4.1). It employs the traditional iconography of the heroic equestrian portrait but presents a wholly new interpretation in which the civilizing values of peace and order are emphasized. Without undue pomp or circumstance, Cecil rides through the prospering countryside "decked with peace and (the child of peace) good husbandry".³ In one hand he holds

honeysuckle and a pink or gillyflower, signifiers associated with the queen. In the other he grasps the reins controlling the elaborate bit, symbol of temperance, to give reasoned guidance to the mule, otherwise traditionally seen as governed by instinctive responses. He can, the painting implies, travel through the uncorrupted environment of the English country without the need of sword or armour. His arms, enclosed in the Garter, hang in the established manner on an oak tree also entwined with honeysuckle, the label of 'natural' authority thus associated with monarch and nation that guarantees peace and prosperity through its civilizing influence. His solid figure dominates the scene. The image oozes probity. It is a very different but no less powerful territorial image, within its own terms of reference, than that of the queen in the Ditchley portrait (Fig.4.2). She stands protectively but imperiously over a map of the kingdom, silhouetted against the sky like a great bejewelled tower. Her back is to the storm she has calmed and she gestures with her right hand towards the peaceful blue air that her presence commands. Like Cecil she requires no weapon to exercise authority over nature itself. It is by these calming principles, not by exciting the passions that they order the realm. Looked at as pendants, the images convincingly promote the complimentary personae that both wished to implant in the imagination.

Cecil's interest in manipulation the real landscape to his own ends at Burghley from the very outset of his first building campaign in the 1550s is clear from the available documentation. House and gardens - without which, in Francis Bacon's opinion, "buildings and palaces are but gross handymarks"⁴ - were conceived together as the focus, and to a certain extent the product, of a tightly knit infrastructure that was the whole estate. As much attention appears to have been given to the design and construction of the gardens and park as to the architecture of the house. Furthermore, the same conceptual planning and executive responsibility were being applied by the same people to house and surroundings. The information concerning the gardens and park is contained in many instances within the same documents that deal with the building of the house, dating mainly from the mid-1550s to the mid-1560s. The garden in England may not "have

become the province of the architect"⁵ until the 1620s, but the design mechanisms producing the architecture at Burghley were also producing the garden plan and execution.

Almost no vestige of the sixteenth-century formal gardens that surrounded the house at Burghley remain above ground.⁶ They and their seventeenth-century successors were wiped out in the wholesale destruction of this species of garden for which Capability Brown has largely been held responsible, but for which, as recent research on Brown has proposed, his followers and later gardeners were frequently accountable.⁷ Opinions as to the result, like attitudes to the manner of formal gardens they replace, have been and remain contentious and subjective. In 1904 Gotch considered that the annihilation of the previously "admirable setting" gave the great house "the appearance of rising suddenly from the untutored park"⁸ while in 1953 Hussey's judgement was that its replacement provided "the ideal spacious setting for the great rectangular mass" of the house.⁹

The earliest map of the estate is by Thomas Thorpe, brother of the more famous John, made in 1623. It shows the orchard and gardens only as outlined by their surrounding boundaries (Plan 24). There are no known plans or illustrations of the grounds made during Cecil's lifetime, apart from the sketch plan of the court of husbandry (Plan 12). The earliest known illustration of the house and gardens is Caldwell's late eighteenth-century engraving after Tillemans' pen and ink drawing of 1719,¹⁰ (Fig A.4). By 1719 the extensive development of the gardens under the direction of the ubiquitous George London, had been undertaken.¹¹ This work had reached full maturity when John Haynes, a surveyor from York, was commissioned by the 9th Earl in 1755 to make a series of topographical drawings as well as a plan of the house and survey of the gardens and park, prior to the proposed remodelling of the house and grounds by Brown (Figs A.6.a-f & Plans F8 & F9). These later representations taken in consideration with the sixteenth-century documentation nevertheless still provide vital clues as to the nature of the sixteenth-century environment of Burghley.

Before a close analysis of the gardens can be undertaken, however, it is necessary to examine the wider background of Cecil's political outlook and interest in the whole subject of horticulture as well as the purely local context of the environment of Burghley taken as a complete entity. It is here that research has initially been focused in order to analyse his ambitions for the gardens and landscaping at Burghley.

As with architecture, the whole subject of horticulture was a serious as well as a pleasurable pursuit for Cecil. He was a voracious collector of rare plants and his language is strewn with garden metaphors. Treating with the French was "a matter indeed like a maze to walk in".¹² After an audience given to the Spanish ambassador, he intended to quiz the queen to see if her "roots were shaken"¹³ by the diplomat's rhetoric. Without a powerful friend a man was like a "hop without a pole" and without the goodwill of his kin, as exposed as "an arbour in Winter".¹⁴ In November 1562 he instructed Thomas Wyndebank, accompanying Thomas Cecil on the Continent, to proceed to Italy and do as much travelling as possible for on their return he meant his wayward son to marry and to "plant" him at Burghley.¹⁵

Cecil's most significant horticultural achievement was as the entrepreneur responsible for the creation of at least three important gardens, at Burghley, Cecil House and Theobalds. His patronage of gardening was arguably as influential as was his patronage of architecture. It was an enthusiasm taken up by both of his sons who not only built magnificent mansions but established important gardens of their own to surround them; Robert, patron of John Tradescant the Elder and de Caus at Hatfield, Chelsea, Pymms and Cranborne; and Thomas at Wimbledon and Wothorpe. Cecil's former ward, Edward de la Zouche, 11th Baron Harringworth who was equally keen, became a patron to the great Dutch botanist Mathias de l'Obel who laid out his famous garden at Hackney.¹⁶ De l'Obel, who knew Cecil's gardens in London, had come to England with another eminent Dutch botanist, Pena, in 1569.¹⁷

familiar to Cosimo di Medici who was renowned for his accomplishment in the art.²⁶ The company of gardeners was of the very highest order.

By the time the Herball was first published Gerard had been overseeing Cecil's gardens at Theobalds and Cecil House for some twenty years, and he also took the opportunity in the dedication to use them as a vehicle for self-congratulation:

"...gardens, especially such as your Honor hath, furnished with many rare simples, do singularly delight when in them a man doth behold a flourishing show of somer beauties in the midst of winters force and a goodly spring of flowers when abroad a leaf is not to be seen".²⁷

Gerard himself went "abroad" on a number of plant-hunting expeditions and in the catalogue of his own garden, Catalogus arborum, fruticum ac plantarum tum indigenarum, quam exoticarum, in horto Johannis Gerardi ... nascentium, published the year before and also dedicated to Cecil, he lists over 1,000 different plants. By the second half of the seventeenth century the sort of genetic engineering that Gerard was practising in Cecil's garden was under question by the poet Marvell. Inverting the political kudos that mastering nature conferred, he transformed it into a metaphor for despotism:

"The pink grew then as double as his Mind;
The nutriment did change its kind.....
Another World was search'd, through Oceans new,
To find the Marvel of Peru...
No Plant now knew the Stock from which it came;
He grafts upon the Wild the Tame:
His green Seraglio has its Eunuchs too;
Lest any Tyrant him out-doe...."²⁸

Comprehensively outstripping works on the theory and practice of building, at least nineteen original or partly original garden books and herbals were published in England during the sixteenth century. Of those published in the latter half, three are dedicated to Cecil.¹⁸ Thomas Hill's The Gardener's Labyrinth,¹⁹ in Henrey's view gives "an excellent idea of the management and contents of a small garden in the days of Queen Elizabeth."²⁰

In an earlier book published in 1568, Hill illustrated two patterns for mazes which pre-date by six years the publication of almost identical designs by du Cerceau in his plan of Gaillon.²¹ Garden designs deriving from a common corpus of material, in a similar manner to architectural plans and illustrations of decorative detail, were being rapidly disseminated throughout Europe, and England was no exception. The woodcuts in the well-illustrated Gardener's Labyrinth compare favourably with those of similar contemporary publications in Europe and almost certainly were inspired by the wealth of fashionable prints for works on gardens coming particularly from the Antwerp presses in the middle of the century (Fig. 4.3).²²

The two other dedications to Cecil were both made by the famous herbalist, John Gerard. The elegantly engraved title page of his Herball (1597), is also taken from a European source, as are many of the woodcuts of the specimens.²³ In the encomium dedicating the book to Cecil, Gerard compares him to the great throughout history who were known for their love of gardens, the principal example being "Salomon": "Salomon is before the rest and greater whose wisdom and knowledge was such that he was able to set out the nature of all plants from the highest Cedar to the lowest mosse."²⁴

Gerard praises Cecil for following in this tradition, "now sadly neglected". Cicero, whose authority Cecil so often turned to, discoursed on the art of gardening in the form of grafting, as a skill worthy of emperors,²⁵ an allusion that would have been equally

While the issue of man's interference with nature through art or artifice was a subject of debate in the sixteenth century, suspicion of the manipulative possibilities of science was more common on the grounds of exercising power through magic. No sinister implications from the botanical alchemy demonstrated in Cecil's garden appear to have yet disturbed the smooth imaginative parallel Gerard was drawing between the 'natural' intellectual authority of a great statesman and the ability to cause nature to flourish in such an unnatural way. Francis Bacon, who was almost certainly familiar with his uncle's gardens, saw the practice in a similarly positive light. His imagined Utopian institute, itself called "The House of Salomon", was dedicated to the expansion of "the Human Empire". Amongst its other wonders: "we make ... trees and flowers to come earlier or later than their seasons and to come up and bear more speedily than by their natural course they do. We make them also by art greater much than their nature, and their fruit greater and sweeter".²⁹

Nearly fifty years before Gerard's works were published, Cecil was in close contact with the "father of English botany",³⁰ the Cambridge educated physician and outspoken Protestant cleric, William Turner. Turner had studied botany in Italy, Switzerland and Flanders and already had a high reputation in Europe before entering Somerset's household from where he also directed the garden at Sion. In 1551 he had published his enormously influential New Herbal.³¹

Clearly Cecil's own interest in the sort of specialist first-hand information contained in Turner's book had been stimulated by the time he went to Flanders in June 1555, just as he was about to start major work in the garden and park at Burghley.³² Flanders, and in particular the university town of Louvain which he visited, was becoming established as the most advanced centre for the academic study of botany and the practice of horticulture.³³ In a note marked as from Flanders, 13 June 1555, Cecil minutely detailed instructions on how to propagate oak, elm and walnut trees.³⁴ As natural timber resources diminished and demand increased, so the need for more efficient planning and

the commercial advantage of good management of timber production grew. Lists of revenues from timber sales show that Cecil was already deriving a good income from woods on his estates by the end of the 1550s.³⁵ Later in his career he was to instigate one of the first formally recorded tree planting schemes.³⁶ The huge areas of enclosed parkland in the country were themselves contributing to the timber shortage at this time. In 1585 Cecil received a complaint from Northamptonshire that "the repair of park pales doth yearly consume more than half as much good timber as all other things"³⁷ with a plea for walls or hedges to replace wooden pales.³⁸ At Burghley, however, as Camden noted, the park had a "stone wall of great extent".³⁹

John Norris, who from his letter of 1556 seems to have had particular charge of timber construction in the house, was also employed by Cecil to inspect his woodlands and assess the timber⁴⁰ which was probably utilized wherever possible in the building as part of Cecil's vertically integrated economic infrastructure.⁴¹

Evidence of Cecil's eagerness to take advantage of the latest developments in Europe is apparent in much of his correspondence with Wyndebank in the early 1560s. Writing to him in Paris in 1561 Cecil entreated, "I pray you Wyndebank, if ye thynk that ye can pleasur me sendyng me in season of the yere things mete for my orchard or garden help me".⁴² Of even more interest is his next request, "if also ye can, procure for me an apt man for myn orchard or garden. First send me word and the chargees. You know my garden is new and must be applyed".⁴³ On 27th August of the same year he urged Thomas Cecil, "If ye can in that coutrey [find] any things mete for my garden send me word thereof".⁴⁴ Henry VIII is known to have had a number of French gardeners working on the royal gardens from the 1540s,⁴⁵ and Cecil obviously had no inhibitions about the possibility of importing a European expert in this field. There is no record of a foreign gardener at Burghley but the early 1560s was when Cecil's attention and purse were focused on the new south and west gardens there, and just when he was giving considerable heed to the planning and planting of the new orchard.⁴⁶

By the Spring of 1562 Armagil Waad informed him that the gardener at Greenwich would supply him with plants. These included lavender, spike, hissop, thyme, rosemary and sage, and, Waad added, he could send to Hampton Court or Richmond if he needed more.⁴⁷ In the same way as Cecil was using connections in the Royal Works over architectural matters, he was profiting from his contacts for his gardens. Commercial nurseries did not become the main source of plant supply until the seventeenth century in England, and in the 1560s the royal gardens must still have been the richest source of stock in the country. There is some evidence of traffic in plants between London and Burghley.⁴⁸ In November 1557 Abraham's report implies that he had received a consignment of trees from London, while in December of the previous year he had sent some trees in the other direction.⁴⁹

On New Year's day, March 1561/2, Cecil wrote to Wyndebank that Sir Francis Carew - an ambitious rival gardener⁵⁰ - was sending home orange, lemon, pomegranate and myrtle trees from France. Cecil boasted "I have already an orange tree," but wanted specimens of the other plants together with "a perfect declaration of how they ought to be kept" to be sent to London together with Carew's order.⁵¹ Wyndebank duly sent myrtles and a lemon tree in April 1562, with copious instructions for their cultivation, and how they should be brought from garden to house before winter.⁵² It is possible, as Burgon argues, that as Cecil already claimed to have an orange tree, he was the first known grower of the fruit in Britain.⁵³ Undoubtedly the letters demonstrate that the eagerness and the competitive impulse to be in at the beginning of the cultivation and ownership of new and exotic varieties which was to reach such fantastic proportions in the seventeenth century, was already underway by the middle of the sixteenth century. Even in More's *Utopia* the spirit of rivalry surfaced in the gardens, where the "zest in keeping them is increased not merely by the pleasure afforded them but by the keen competition between blocks as to which will have the best kept garden."⁵⁴

For Cecil this early zeal to possess exotics did not diminish and there are frequent examples throughout his career of his contacts in Europe and farther afield supplying him with specialities. In May 1578, William Ward sent him fifty sorts of seeds from Florence "the rarest and most excellent to be found in all Italy",⁵⁵ while in April of the following year Thomas Cotton sent him "a little tree which here is held to be something rare" from Flanders.⁵⁶ Gerard acknowledged in the Herball that the Martagon or Turks-cap lily was first sent from Turkey together with many other bulbs of "rare and dantie flowers by master Harbran ambassador there, unto my honorable and good lord and master the Lord Treasurer of England".⁵⁷

As Gerard's dedications in the 1590s confirm, Cecil's ambitions as a plantsman were to be realized magnificently in London and at Theobalds. These became Cecil's most celebrated gardens. But the correspondence concerning Burghley reveals that an enclosed courtyard, loggia, penthouse, south facing terraces surrounding sunken gardens, an irrigation scheme, and a layout of subdivided and therefore sheltered areas were already being created there in the 1550s and 1560s in conjunction with the architectural development of the house. These are all features favourable for the culture of the tender plants being introduced from warmer Mediterranean climates. By 1585 the Earl of Shrewsbury was sending orange trees north to Worksop,⁵⁸ and as Thomas Hoby recorded in his diary for 1549, they could also be transported from one site to another "five miles outside Mantua ther is a verie bewtifull house of pleasure of the Duk called Marmerolwhere the Duke hathe certain oreng trees whiche he may remove from place to place".⁵⁹ In the Gardener's Labyrinth Hill describes how tender plants such as oranges should be set in chests which "at will and pleaure may be rolled hither and thither."⁶⁰

Beyond the mere aping of modern Italian and French interpretations of the classical garden style, however, the plants from these regions themselves carried a powerful symbolic significance rich in convenient allegorical associations for those, like Cecil, with a political interest in claiming direct links with classical culture. The plants requested from

Wyndebank, for instance, all have a classical heritage. The pomegranate is an attribute of Proserpine for whom Aeneas had to pluck the Golden Bough. Myrtle and citrus fruits are sacred to Venus. The use of such horticultural allusions applied to contemporary rulers was a commonplace hyperbole of European Renaissance power-mongering. In his poem dedicated to Francesco Gonzaga on his victory over Charles VIII of France in 1495, for example, Pontano's eulogy describes how: "Venus herself brought citrus trees to Italy so that the descendants of Aeneas might restore their ancient brightness.....the gardener's apparently humble craft sustains from age to age the goddess's sacred tree".⁶¹

Cecil was to establish a programme of imperial iconography in the courtyard at Burghley which implied dynastic connections, ultimately deriving from Aeneas. Venus's fruits, symbolizing the restoration of the Golden Age, growing unexpectedly, almost miraculously in the very place, would have been a tremendous conceit, perfect for impressing the court and latent with possibilities for flattering the Queen. In 1565 in a poem dedicated to William of Orange, *Traduit de l'Anglais*, Charles Utenhove, the Flemish poet who became Cecil's protégé and spy, likened the fruit of the orange to the golden apple that incited the Trojan War.⁶² Meanwhile the radiance of the queen, "Thou that makest a day of night",⁶³ was so powerful it could ripen such fruit with a glance.

Gardens provided a rich source of allegorical allusions for the extravagant set-pieces of progress visits. Direct evidence of Cecil's own political deployment of plant and garden imagery is apparent in the "gardener's" speech, delivered to the queen on her visit to Theobalds in May 1591. The vehicle for the eulogy was an arbour of homage to the queen, designed for a new garden at Pymms, another Cecil acquisition, at Edmonton. It was fashioned of the single rose, the eglantine, itself the name of the mythical princess of Meryfleur who was said to be descended from the Trojan line,⁶⁴ and was one of the many emblems of the queen. The "gardener" gives credit to the patron for devising the iconographic programme: "my master's conceit out-stripped my cunning: 'Eglantine' quoth he, 'I most honour, and it hath been told me that the deeper it is rooted in the ground, the

sweeter it smelleth in the flower, making it ever so green that the sun of Spain at the hottest cannot parch it".⁶⁵ The "molecatcher" was similarly used as a mouthpiece, deftly taking up the metaphor of the maze - used elsewhere by Cecil himself to describe the complexity of diplomatic affairs.⁶⁶ "Sure I am that the ground was so knotty that the gardener was amazed to see it".⁶⁷

The garden allegory was sustained during the visit through the device of the "Heremite of Tybole", the embodiment of the contemplative life, in a speech given to the queen and the French ambassador. The hermit had taken over "fair Tybollet" "suffering yoor solitary eye to bring into hiz house desolation and moorning, joyes destroyers, and annoye frendes whereby Paradice is grown Wilderness".⁶⁸ The decorum of the place had been overturned by the retirement of the true master of the house to the hermit's cell, and the hermit was commanded, in the person of the queen, to restore the status quo by repossessing it. The device of the hermit was repeated as a sequential episode when the queen came again to Theobalds in 1594.⁶⁹ This time the hermit pleaded with the queen to employ the services of the son of his "Founder" whom he feared otherwise might take-over his retreat "rather for a place of recreation than meditation".⁷⁰ By the artifice of the hermit, an otherwise bald appeal accompanied by equally transparent flattery, was transformed into an acceptably entertaining conceit.

The iconography of the garden and its purpose as a place for entertainment and sociable, rather than solitary pleasures were firmly integrated into Cecil's political agenda. Cicero had similarly advocated the gardens of his villa of Tusculanum not for lonely contemplation but as the ideal environment for stimulating debate and social interaction. "Therefore whyles we walked we fell into this talke",⁷¹ he explained of the discourse amongst members of the academy he established there. The evidence relating to the garden at Burghley suggests a plan similarly designed for circulation, in which the visitor was encouraged to go forth from the house and take in the various encounters of each part of the garden, which though individually defined, were interconnected (see Plan F7). The

garden, like the house was organised for active perambulation rather than passive observation. The visitors would have been guided through the gardens and out into the park by stone gateways defining the route, with garden seats, arbours, and mounts for conversational pauses and taking in the view along the way. These features mentioned in the documents discussed below are the counterparts echoing the bay windows, tower closets and belvederes on the parade circuit around the house.

The more interactive and outward-looking intention is a clear departure in design philosophy from the protective inward-looking enclosures, perceived as havens of withdrawal from the outside world, which were described and admired in influential gardens of the first half of the century. In 1521 Thornbury Castle was reported as "a goodlie garden to walke inne cloosed wth high walls imbattled"⁷² while Cavendish portrayed Wolsey's garden at Hampton Court in the manner of the symbolic hortus conclusus of the Virgin, as "My garden sweet enclosed with walls strong".⁷³ The environment of Burghley by contrast was not the sort of claustrophobic enclosure embracing "a dead and standing pool of air";⁷⁴ nor was it intended for "sumptuous and selfish solitude",⁷⁵ accusations which were subsequently levelled at inward-looking garden designs perceived as typical of the sixteenth century.

The Surroundings of Burghley House

The Park

Far from "selfish solitude", hospitality was implicit in the creation of the park. Deer provided the means for both "When thou would'st feast, or exercise thy friends".⁷⁶ The communal activity of deer hunting could only be enjoyed in the sixteenth century if offered by a royal patron or wealthy and privileged private landowner. Good hunting could raise the value of land in the sixteenth century just as good shooting does in the twentieth.⁷⁷ To be asked to hunt was a coveted invitation. The Duchess of Suffolk, for example, offered Cecil a day's hunting at Grimsthorpe in 1552 (before he had begun to create his own park), though she apologized for the lack of bucks, considered to provide

the best sport.⁷⁸ Hunting appears to have become part of the hospitality expected by Cecil's peers even on casual visits to Theobalds. In 1584 Leicester wrote to Cecil that in his host's absence, he and some other friends had been "bold to make some of your stags afraid but killed none".⁷⁹

At Burghley Cecil began a comprehensive programme of improvement to create the surrounding park at the same time as he first began developing the house and garden. Clearly, there was an economic advantage in mind from some of the land improvement. Indeed, in December 1561 Kemp was urging a rather reluctant Cecil to let out the land that was not destined to be emparked at an advantageous rate to bring in some income.⁸⁰ The main thrust of the work and the main expense, however, seems to have been concentrated on preparation for what was to become the park, and large imported labour forces were employed to this end.

Cecil already had first hand knowledge of the rationale and management of royal parks as surveyor of Elizabeth's properties since 1550.⁸¹ Given the detailed and practical attention that he applied to everything he undertook and his preoccupation with established form and ceremony, it would have been surprising if he had ignored the functional logic underlying the decorum of such sporting landscapes when creating his own. In fact, the habits of the deer were already having a bearing on planting proposals at Burghley in November 1561, when Kemp explained the elaborate arrangements for organising the only physical protection now thought necessary, to guard the garden from destruction by the adult deer. Kemp proposed to alter a plan sent to Cecil to take advantage of a bank and construct a "dead hedge" on its outside edge so that together they would rise to a total height of nine feet above the level of the park. This would protect young, live hedges until they were established. He would plant two rows of thorn, and a third of holly "wch shall be on the inside of the walk and above all the Rest" and this holly "apering above all the hedge ever opene wyll do fayre Inough".⁸²

The desired end was to have the smarter more vulnerable holly hedge showing on the garden side. From the walk in between on top of the bank, one would be able to look not only into the garden, but - as the other hedges on the outside of the walk were to be lower than the holly - out to the park as well. Kemp gives no clue as to where this arrangement was to be, but the idea of taking advantage of the raised bank as a walk indicates an appreciation that the necessary barrier should not impede the outward prospect from the garden.

In December 1561 Kemp reported "I shall do my best to put brooms in the drye close with some other thorns but for gorse I hold not for the deer will never have pleasure to come amongst them and I fear not amongst the broom neither".⁸³ Again he suggested planting thorn and holly instead. Broom and gorse, some of which Kemp had sold, were both renewable commodities with a ready market as high-energy fuel,⁸⁴ so the habitually cost-conscious Kemp was proposing that Cecil sacrifice utility shrubs for the sake of the park.

Kemp also needed a "company of labour ..for the setting of trees in divers places of the closes" as well as for "the digging of the garden and the making of ponds".⁸⁵ The following January he was warning Cecil that he would have to lay off the "company of ditchers" if he did not receive instructions for their deployment immediately. The work Cecil wanted completed was obviously demanding and Kemp informed him that "between the warrant [warren] gate and the house both for yt the ground is not very good and by reason of the great pit it will be hard bringing of the double ditch".⁸⁶ Kemp proposed paling some of the park for want of hedging stock, and reminded Cecil that "the warrant wall it were needful it were finished because it is parcel of the park." The work had been measured, so it was going to be undertaken on the modern piece-work system and would cost "above five pounds plus the digging of the stone".⁸⁷ Calculated on the fee for "making of an acre of wall of ij yards high and ij foote thick - viij shillings",⁸⁸ itemized in

Cecil's hand on a list for work at Burghley, this would represent a wall some 275 yards long left to complete the work.⁸⁹

By February 1561/2 Kemp was excusing himself to Cecil for not being up-to-date with the accounts, being "so troubled with the provision of stuff and workmen for the inclosure of the park as I was never the people[?] are so unconstant".⁹⁰ Apart from those working on the fencing and walling, there were also "two men who do nothing but set young trees nor shall til mid March be come".

Work on the landscape surrounding the house had begun at least five years earlier in November 1557 when Abraham had reported that "your quick settes which are in good forwardness for West hath done in the nether close bochers and in the heth close so much as is required and Bardall hath done in the oke close x acres".⁹¹ Cecil had requested a hedge to be made but Abraham wanted to know his "pleasure" as the men were so wearied with carting stone that they could not carry the hedging stuff the distance "from your own wood." Weather permitting, he anticipated finishing about 4th December "for the groundwork of all cdi acre except is digged and filled".⁹² Nor was this the end of planting, for on December 12 Abraham reported that more than forty five chestnut trees had been "set".⁹³

The "oake close" is listed as within the park on a terrier of 1561. The only close listed as outside the park on the terrier is the "mylne close",⁹⁴ suggesting that the 1557 work was concentrated in the twenty-one acres of woodland area that was to be within the park.

Considering the amount of work already almost completed in 1557, and that the job was still not finished in 1561, it gives some idea of the scale of the whole undertaking. In the eighteenth century Walpole reported that the practice of organising the landscape "with loose groves of oaks though still with surrounding hedges" which appears to have

been the plan at Burghley, continued to be recommended by Bridgeman. Haynes's 1755 south view of the garden shows similar, albeit tidier versions of such groves (Fig A.6a).⁹⁵

Deer parks, William Harrison noted disapprovingly in the Descriptions of England (1586), were the ultimate non-producing status symbols:

"a circuit of these enclosures... contain oftentimes a walk of four or five miles... whereby it is to be seen what store of ground is employed upon that vain comodity which bringeth no manner of gain or profit to the owner, sith they commonly give away their flesh, never taking a penny for the same,... for venison in England is neither bought nor sold as in other countries but maintained only for pleasure of the owner and his friends."⁹⁶

As Erasmus observed in his passage satirizing hunting in Praise of Folly, "Common folk can cut up an ox or a sheep of course, but only a gentleman has the right to carve wild game".⁹⁷ In September 1562 the Bishop of Peterborough's chaplain wrote to Cecil apologizing that he had "requested to have a piece of venison whereof I have written to Mr. Kempe, beinge the rather boldened to do so through the bisshop's request thereof".⁹⁸ No doubt the bishop wanted to impress his guest, Sir Walter Mildmay, but even he could only get hold of venison supplied by a friend. Kemp does not seem to have been responsible for the stock management of Cecil's royal tenures in the area, and the fact that he was asked to supply game on Cecil's behalf suggests that a deer park at Burghley was already considered to be established by 1562.

Cecil already had large land holdings in Northamptonshire and Lincolnshire but in view of the time and expense devoted to creating the park, his ambitions for the surroundings of Burghley seem to have been for quality rather than quantity of landscape. The survey (terrier) made in January 1561, totalled only a modest 132 acres classed as "within the park".⁹⁹ Holdenby Park, created by Hatton between 1580 and 1587 was

more than four times this size.¹⁰⁰ As Till points out, Cecil was dealing in property throughout his life¹⁰¹ and by the 1580s, if not before, the surrounding park may well have been more substantial, although even by 1623 Thomas Thorpe's survey plan shows the estate immediately surrounding Burghley covering no more than 448 acres.

Its limited size may account for the mystery of why Burghley does not appear to have been officially emparked by Cecil. It was, in Harrison's words, illegal "for any man to have or make a chase park or free warren without good warranty of the king by his charter or perfect title of prescription".¹⁰² The inclusion of a "horse pasture" within the park suggests that in other respects Cecil was making all the right moves to signal ownership of a genuine park.¹⁰³ Since 1536 those with parks one mile in circumference were required to keep a minimum of two mares because of fears of the consequences of widespread emparking on horse breeding.¹⁰⁴ Camden obviously perceived the surroundings of Burghley as a park.¹⁰⁵ But Burghley is not shown as amongst the twenty-seven parks marked on Speed's map of Northamptonshire published in 1610, and in Morton's *The Natural History of Northamptonshire* (1712), he remarks that "many new parks had been enclosed, near Stamford, the Park of Burghley" (Fig 4.5).¹⁰⁶

The speed and resource lavished on the undertaking of the park (continuing through a period of declared financial difficulty in 1561,¹⁰⁷) point towards an urgency for modelling a visually improved 'park' landscape complete with deer. All the visual evidence of a hunting park surrounding the house, the *sine qua non* of entertaining the queen and court on a serious basis, was established, but it must have been restricted to 'park' rather than 'chase' hunting. Park hunting was a far more artificial affair than open forest hunting whereby the selected quarry was driven from the coverts towards the hunting party by the keepers. The kill was effected from specially constructed stands from where the privileged few would display their prowess with the bow. This heavily man-managed system allowed for predictable sport in a relatively confined area. The landscape became the scenery for the sport rather than the terrain of the chase. Both landscape and

sport were visually splendid but tamed versions of the original state in the wild. As Seneschal of Cliffe Park Cecil could still be seen as the provider of a chase hunt in the Royal Forest of Rockingham. Indeed, it was here that the hunt was scheduled for the queen during her proposed progress visit to Burghley in the Summer of 1566.¹⁰⁸ The more showy sport, which the queen also enjoyed, could take place at Burghley.

"All they achieve by this incessant hunting and eating wild game is their own degeneration.... though all the time they imagine they lead a life fit for kings".¹⁰⁹ It was precisely the latter aspect of hunting which Erasmus was debunking that made it such an ideal form of prestige corporate entertainment and display for the monarch and the court. As the French Ambassador's envoy duly reported to him from Stamford during the queen's 1566 visit, she "would have desired you there if it had not been too much trouble for you, just for the pleasure you could have taken hunting with her and seen her kill some deer".¹¹⁰ Acting out the role of "Queen and huntress chaste and faire",¹¹¹ particularly in front of a Frenchman who would have been familiar with the glamour of Dianesque imagery used so effectively by Diane of Poitiers, would no doubt have been relished by Queen Elizabeth (Fig. 4.6). Indeed, this became a popular theme of progress entertainments, enabling the extension of the queen's love of hunting into a mythological conceit which utilized not only art and performance, but the landscape itself.¹¹²

Hunting had become so popular with the court during Henry's reign that when foreign dignitaries were being entertained restrictions sometimes had to be put on the number of followers, despite the vast new tracts of land enclosed as royal parks and forests in and around London. At several royal palaces smaller satellite lodges were built to cater for hunting parties in parks some distance from the main residence.¹¹³ These more intimate, less formal residences became increasingly popular during the century. Thomas Cecil's Wothorpe, famously for withdrawal "while Burghley was asweeping", was to be just such a retreat.¹¹⁴ On Cecil's map of Cliffe Park by Richard Shute (1593), a fancifully shaped lodge no doubt for hospitality during hunting, is represented right at the

heart of the park.¹¹⁵ Some twenty years after Cecil began grooming and preparing the landscape surrounding Burghley, the prospect room that was a feature of the roofscape in his later building campaign, would have provided similarly enticing informal entertainment space. Removed from the stricter etiquette necessary within the main body of the house, it would have given a magnificent grandstand view of the hunting spectacle in the maturing park.¹¹⁶

The conspicuous consumption of land for the keeping of deer is still the most instantly recognizable elitist landscape, despite the fact that the hunting of deer has long since removed altogether to other terrain. This visual manner of demonstrating possession does not deny an aesthetic intention. Superiority is demonstrated by the very attractiveness of the signal and the opportunities for pleasure that it appears to promise. In the sixteenth century the twin objectives were naturally conjoined by the royal pastime of hunting - itself a supremely visual sport. The demands of even the artificial chase determined a particular aesthetic, as is evident from Markam's description of English parkland in 1616: "the beauty and gracefulness of the parke" and the lofty trees on the hills "which are commonly called the views or discoveries of parkes", contrasted with the "lawndes" or grazing grounds and the valleys which provided "coverts or places of leave for wild beasts."¹¹⁷

Walpole acknowledged that those who had been responsible for founding the long-established deer parks in England, the "contracted forests, extended gardens", had discovered the "principle of modern gardening", but he dismissed the idea that they had any aesthetic awareness or appreciation of what they had created. On the contrary "having long ago stumbled on this principle" he found it extraordinary that "we should have persisted in retaining its reverse, symmetrical and unnatural gardens".¹¹⁸

From Walpole's chosen political stand-point in the eighteenth century the tension between the two styles - the one comprising "paternal entrenchments",¹¹⁹ the other

signalling the landscape of liberty - made an extremely effective polemic. The meaning attached to ordered, geometrically disposed ground which in fifteenth-century Florence, for example, had been celebrated as expressing the harmonious and successful republic,¹²⁰ was anachronistically warped by Walpole into an expression of narrow-minded authoritarianism. But in the early seventeenth century Bacon saw no ideological conflict between conceiving the main body of a garden as ideally constituting twelve acres of square ground partitioned by hedges, terraces and borders and bounded by arched alleyways, with an equal appreciation of the surrounding 'natural' landscape which could be admired over the end walls of the enclosure. This barrier, he recommended, should be left "breast high, to look abroad into the fields",¹²¹ just as the walk on the bank between the hedges at Burghley that Kemp was constructing in 1561 would have allowed.¹²²

The manipulation of the immediate landscape at Burghley in the sixteenth century into overtly man-made garden to encompass the house did not, therefore, preclude an equally compelling but contrasting intention for what lay beyond. Both were governed by their own decorum. Rather than the "untutored park"¹²³ reaching to the doorstep, the formal gardens became overt extensions of the ordering principles of the architecture, but beyond this the park signified that the benign influence emanated further, to be discretely acknowledged by nature itself. Consciousness of the concept of the aesthetic appeal to eye, mind and spirit of large-scale 'natural' landscape planning could hardly be more clearly expressed than it was by Boorde in 1542:

"the prospect to and fro the place be pleasaunt, fayre, and good to the eye, to beholde the woodes, the waters, the felde, the vales, the hylles, and the playne ground, And that euery thyng be desent and fayre to the eye not only within the precyncte of the place appoynted to buylde a mansyon or a howse, to see the commodityes aboute it, but also [that] it may be placable to the eyes of all men to se & to beholde whan they be a good dystaunce of from the place, that it do stand commodiously. For the commodious

buyldyng of a place doth not onely satysfye the mynde of the inhabytour,
but also it doth comforte and reioyseth a mannes herte to se it, specyally the
pulcruse prospect".¹²⁴

Sidney's descriptions of landscape display a similar appreciation wherein "Art
..would needs be delightful by counterfeiting his enemy Error and making order in
confusion".¹²⁵ By the 1580s the idea of a man-made 'natural' landscape was so powerful
in Spenser's eyes that he put it forward as the consummate earthly temptation of the Bower
of Bliss:

"The dales for shade, the hilles for breathing space,
The trembling groves, the Christall running by;
And that, which all faire workes doth most aggrace,
The art, which all that wrought appeared in no place."¹²⁶

There is a coincidence between Boorde's recommendations for the real thing and the
imaginary landscapes of the poets. All three authors were addressing the courtly audience
and must have anticipated the appreciation of their concept of the beauty of 'natural' scenery
would be reciprocated within that culture.

Burghley's "scituation" was described by Celia Fiennes following her visit in 1697
as "the finest I ever saw, on the edge of a hill ...a very broad Glide or visto that looks
finely to the River and to the adjacent hills, a distance cloth[ed] with fine woods" and
furthermore that "it is esteemed the finest house and scituation that is in England".¹²⁷
Bridges, writing some twenty years later asserted that "The park here was made by the
Lord Treasurer Cecil.... the park is ornamented with plantations of ash, elm chestnut and
other trees.. . Few seats, either in England or abroad exceed Burghley House"
(Fig.4.7).¹²⁸

While this idyllic landscape, like Boorde's, sounds deceptively like a celebration of the native unmodelled English countryside, the original "pulcruse prospects" before Cecil's improvements and planting schemes would have been far less glossy. Fiennes, of course, was writing almost exactly one hundred years after Cecil's death and when the 5th Earl of Exeter's garden work was already well in hand. But the extensive avenues of trees that the 5th Earl had planted in the park could only have been saplings and it cannot have been these that created such an impact. The park had been enlarged by John, Earl of Exeter in 1665,¹²⁹ and seems to have been well maintained during the seventeenth century. Nevertheless, the mature landscape of "the very fine parke ..full of deer and fine rows of trees" as well as the "most noble woods"¹³⁰ that Fiennes describes must fundamentally have constituted the extensive planting of the closes that made up part of the 21 acres of woodland in the park in 1561 and the rows of trees remarked upon by Waldstein,¹³¹ and to a large extent can be credited to the long-term legacy of Cecil's consciously applied "art".

The formal entry progress through park to garden to house in the sixteenth century was from the west, and so it is from here that a reconstruction of the plan of the gardens and analysis of the relationship between the gardens and the surrounding landscape will begin (see Plan F7).

The West

The main route to the house was via a wide tree-lined avenue as shown on Thomas Thorpe's survey map of 1623, marked as "Burghley Lanes", which agrees with Waldstein's observations of 1600 (Plan 24).¹³² Theobalds was similarly approached by a straight walk about 15yds wide and 550yds long, described in 1603 as lined with elm and ash trees.¹³³ "The Ponde Close" must be the vicinity of the "really fine fishpond"¹³⁴ which Waldstein observed lay before the entrance to the house. "Burghley Lanes" on the map broadens out into an open space at the eastern end from which opens, on a direct axis, an enclosed rectangular courtyard with gateways on its western and eastern sides. Caldwell's engraving shows a lawned court before the basecourt in front of the west face of

the house (Fig. A.4). The basecourt itself is depicted lined with trees, but on Thorpe's map the trees stop well short of the house, allowing an unencumbered view of its form from a distance. Much the same forecourt arrangement can be seen more clearly defined on Ralph Treswell's 1587 estate map of Holdenby, where "the greene" precedes the basecourt. This configuration, praised by Francis Bacon as the ideal introduction to a mansion,¹³⁵ had been adopted by Cecil at Theobalds, where Bacon may indeed have formed his favourable opinion, and which Hatton acknowledged as his model for Holdenby, admired in turn by Cecil.¹³⁶ At least one of the courts at Burghley must have been grassed, for in December 1556 Abraham reported that "your fawns do well and are sometime in the court and sometimes in the bankside and sometime they go into the closes when the maidens go to milk and sometime in the orchard".¹³⁷

At the western end of "Burghley Lanes" on Thorpe's map there is a T-junction. Southwards, it runs between the "Ponde Close" and the "Oke Close" towards another avenue of trees running south, but with no road indicated between them. The 66-acre 'Cowpasture Close' must be the parcel of land referred to as the "Cow Pasture of St Martins" which Cecil only managed to exchange with the freeholders for land in Wothorpe manor in 1598.¹³⁸ The newly acquired territory must have been planted with the avenues of trees shortly afterwards for them to figure so prominently.

The beginning of the route to the house from "Stamford Lane" to the north west, follows the boundary of the "Cunnygrey". Like deer parks these warrens were high-status reservations in the sixteenth century. A "Cunygri" is marked on William Senior's survey plan of Chatsworth of 1617, and Thomas Tresham's exquisite Triangular Lodge begun in 1594 was built at the centre of the warren at Rushton Hall,¹³⁹ ostensibly as the warrener's house. The "Warrant" [warren] referred to by Kemp in January 1561/1562 as needing enclosure as "part and parcel of the park" must be the "Cunnygrey" and the "double ditch" that has to cross the "great pit" from the "warrant gate"¹⁴⁰ was probably drainage needed partly to provide dry ground for the fairway across the valley to the house. The driveway

runs alongside the "Ponde Close" on Thorpe's map, an area which even today lies somewhat wet. The higher ground around Burghley by contrast, has the distinct advantage of being largely constituted of "good road-building material" with a gravel sub-surface that "if laid in a yard, or on a road soon sets so hard, that the wheels of the heaviest carriage make no impression into it".¹⁴¹

It was this material, according to Bridges, from which the Roman road of Ermine Street which bordered the park to the south, was constructed, described by Camden in his delineation of Northamptonshire in Britannia:

" that Roman way which the neighbouring inhabitants call the forty-foot way from its breadth, cuts the shire in two between Caster and Stamford, and appears in a high Causey, especially by the little wood of Berneck where it has a Beacon set upon the very ridge, and so runs along by Burghley Park wall".¹⁴²

The line of the road is marked on the Ordnance Survey map, running across the south of the park (now in part Burghley Park Golf Course) into which it was absorbed in the mid-seventeenth century (Fig. 2.1). "The beacon" must be that referred to by Bridges as the "ancient and strong beacon" that was "not many yards from the corner of Burghleigh park wall....taken down about sixty years ago"¹⁴³ and almost certainly was one of the "towers" which Waldstein apparently saw in the landscape reflected in the chimneypiece.¹⁴⁴

This picturesque tower, that might have improved Walpole's opinion of Burghley's setting, had disappeared from the scenery when, more than half a century after Celia Fiennes, the alteration in taste so convincingly promoted by Walpole gave rise to his rather less glowing account of Burghley's situation: "Prospect, animated prospect, is the theatre that will always be the most frequented. Prospects were formerly sacrificed to convenience

and warmth. Thus Burleigh stands behind a hill, from the top of which it would command Stamford."¹⁴⁵

Cecil did not choose the site of Burghley, but despite the limit to the horizon presented by this sheltering hill, he appears to have exploited its situation to initiate a theatrical introduction to the house, creating a perfect dramatic setting for the sort of spectacular welcoming ceremonies acted out in the landscape at Kenilworth in 1575, Theobalds in 1591 and Bisham in 1592.¹⁴⁶

The steep rise to the west of the house indeed masks it from view when coming from Stamford, until the brow of the hill is reached (Fig A.6f shows the backward view to Stamford). The house then appears quite suddenly and dramatically, its west and south aspects bathed in full sunlight for the whole day from mid-morning. The pattern of progress movements was for the queen to arrive in the late afternoon, (as she was scheduled to do at Burghley in 1566),¹⁴⁷ when the lowering sunlight shows off the house to excellent effect in the manner Alberti advocated, "I would have the Front and whole Body of the House perfectly well lighted, and that it be open to receive a great deal of Light and Sun....let all Things smile and seem to welcome the Arrival of your Guests" (Figs. 4.7 & 5.1)¹⁴⁸

The visitor is presented with a bird's-eye view in the manner which became the popular convention for topographical representations of splendid buildings of which Van Wyndegarde's drawings of the English royal palaces made in the mid-1550s for Philip of Spain were early examples.¹⁴⁹

Those arriving at Burghley would be about four hundred yards from the house which lay directly ahead as they turned through ninety degrees into "Burghley Lanes", far enough away to perceive it and its encircling gardens as a whole, but still near enough for the house to command the surrounding landscape of which it formed the centre-piece.

The route descended into the axially aligned avenue where the prospect towards the great west gateway with its triumphal entrance arch was organised by the perspective lines of the trees that Waldstein noted had been so carefully placed on either side.

The court of husbandry lay to the north of the basecourt. The terrace in front of the house is shown on the east side of the basecourt with a break in its centre (Plan 12) which must indicate the opening into the main courtyard. The basecourt was already in existence in June 1556, for Roger Warde was as anxious to know from Cecil "Yowre plessewre for yore sters forthe of yowre basse kowrt up to the tares [terrace] and for the proporcion of them"¹⁵⁰ in the same way that he requested a drawing for the dormer windows of the house¹⁵¹. He also wanted a design and measurements for the gate that was to be at the end of the same terrace and was advising Cecil on the quality of stone suitable for the outside steps. Clearly, the architecture of the garden was being given as much thought as that of the house and in both cases it was Cecil who was masterminding the design.

In his Memorial of 1561 Cecil listed:

"Item for Ward to make a platt for my court of husbandry
for a corne barne a haye barne a horse stable a brew howse
a dove cote swyne howses a horse milne ij pooles a hovel for cartes".¹⁵²

In the "tryck" of the court enclosed by Kemp which was delivered in October only the dovecote building is missing. A "dovscoot close"¹⁵³ is listed on the 1561 terrier so this may have been re-sited or intended to be built on an existing site as a feature within the park.¹⁵⁴ The "cou~t" is shown as roughly rectangular and extends westwards beyond the basecourt. Kemp's letter implies that Cecil intended existing buildings to be altered and extended to up-grade the support facilities of the estate without reducing storage space, and this possibly explains why in the proposed disposition the "mylne" and the "bakehouse"

are tagged on to the end of the "brewhouse" in such an arbitrary manner. Buildings in this area can be seen in Caldwell (Fig A.4). A substantial double range of buildings, the shorter of which is between fifty and sixty feet long, with a yard separating them and a wing projecting into it from the middle of the southern range, is shown on Haynes survey plan of the estate of 1755, where one would infer this original service court to have been. The similarity between the plans suggests that some of the original sixteenth-century buildings were still extant in the mid-eighteenth century (Plans F9 & 12, Fig. A.6d). Parts of this complex can also be seen on Haynes views of the west and the north fronts, lying on ground which looks to be about 10 ft (3.04 m) below the level of the house, and with steps up to a terrace on the north side of the basecourt.

There was a "lean-to" in the basecourt that had been roofed by November 1557.¹⁵⁵ In the margin beside this information from Abraham, Cecil has added "by Ward".¹⁵⁶ It is reasonable to assume that this referred to Roger Warde which means that this was a stone rather than a timber structure implying something more than a rustic shelter. Such penthouses were particularly recommended by Hill in the Gardener's Labyrinth to keep "delicate young plants such as dates and lemons and oranges under"¹⁵⁷ and, if this was its intended purpose, the sunken court protected on the north and east sides by the service court and the house would have provided an ideally sunny and sheltered position, similar to that of Brown's eighteenth-century orangery on the east side of the house, and in a position immediately to impress the visitor.

The terrace shown on the east side of the basecourt in the "tryck" of 1561, would have been under where Cecil's later west range was built in the 1570s. In 1578 Richard Shute reported to Cecil that doors at either end of the terrace in the south garden were to be made from the two halves of the "litle gate that stoode upon the Terrasse before the olde buyldinges",¹⁵⁸ which would agree with the description of the gate that Warde had been concerned with in 1556.¹⁵⁹

To the south of the base court was the orchard. In Abraham's report of 22 November 1557 he wanted Cecil's decision, "but whether you will have the north end [of the orchard] towards the base court quick set or no I desire to know your pleasure". Holes had been dug ready for fruit trees, he continued, "but none come to be set but ij dozen of crabbe tree storkes that I caused to be gathered and set".¹⁶⁰ Apple and pear trees were being seeded in December and Abraham had instructed "your keepers" to bring stocks for grafting "great medlars".¹⁶¹ In November the hedge on the west side was being "shrouded" to form a sheltering covered walk, probably in a similar manner to that illustrated on the title page of the Gardener's Labyrinth (Fig.4.9). Harrison uses the term "shroud" in a comparable context to describe protective coverts as the "walks and shrouds of wild beasts".¹⁶² The idea at Burghley also sounds similar to that in the orchard laid out at Thornbury Castle by the Duke of Buckingham c.1515 which had "goodly alies to walke ynn openly;" some with "roosting places coverde thoroughly with whitethorn and hasill".¹⁶³ Again in the Gardeners Labyrinth, Hill points out the particular pleasures for the patron of moving through his own landscape along such pathways: "the commodities of these Allies and walkes serve to good purposes, the one that is the owner may diligently view the prosperitie of his herbes and flowers, the other for the delight and comfort of his weried mind".¹⁶⁴

Orchards, with their venerable history from the bible and classical antiquity, were considered to be prestigious plantations in the sixteenth century. Pliny described his apple orchard where the trees were interspersed with obelisks made of box.¹⁶⁵ Wooden obelisks were similarly part of the furniture of the garden at Theobalds, where Cecil also planted a new orchard to the south west of the house.¹⁶⁶ They were also recurrent feature of the architecture at Burghley, although there is no evidence that they occurred in the orchard itself. There is however a surviving stone gateway decorated with obelisks which suggests that the motif was reiterated in the garden at Burghley (Fig. 4.10)¹⁶⁷

Apart from the wealth of specific allegorical references and the historical significance of orchards, the production and evidence of good husbandry that their "fruitfulness" provided were valuable indicators of virtuous ownership, resulting in peace and plenty, that could be invested with meaning beyond the garden gate. Cecil obviously considered them to be high-status areas within the hierarchic order of the garden, important enough, as we have seen, for him to have been looking for a foreign gardener partly "for my orchard" in 1561.¹⁶⁸ He reminded himself twice in the Memorial to "make a platt of my orchard" where he also listed under work for the rough masons, "make a portall at my orchard" and "to make upp ye gate at ye orchard into ye drye close".¹⁶⁹ The orchard is listed on the 1561 terrier as being approximately five and a half acres in area¹⁷⁰ so it was a substantial part of the garden by this time, representing over a quarter of the area of just over nineteen acres of "orchard and gardens" shown on Thorpe's 1623 map.

Already in 1558 James Hurst, curate of Essenden had sent "grafts of apple and pear trees to Burghley".¹⁷¹ Hurst was possibly the same "prest" referred to in Kemp's letter of 18th October 1561 who was overseeing work in the orchard, and preventing Kemp from planting in part of it because it lay so wet,¹⁷² probably in the area that lay next to the "Pond Close". In December of the same year the services of the "prest", the warrener, the shepherd, two carpenters and a mason were being retained by Kemp over the winter.¹⁷³ It seems unlikely that in the absence of the household a priest would have been retained purely to perform religious duties. Cecil's mother, who wanted a priest to be reinstated at the house when she returned to Burghley in 1573, had moved out from Burghley to a house in Stamford by this time.¹⁷⁴ The particular affinity established in the monastic orders between clerics and gardening seems to have survived the Reformation in Northamptonshire. When Thomas Tresham was also looking for a gardener at Lyveden at the end of the century, he wrote that his sister "had a gardener who was bred up under the priest who lately died and excelled in gardening work in Holdenby works".¹⁷⁵

The orchard was somewhat neglected by 1561, or Cecil may have been extending it for it required to be "clensed of thorns" and cleared of stones and the molehills needed cutting;¹⁷⁶ in the molecatcher's speech at Theobalds in 1591, even these humble challenges to human control were to be turned into metaphors for the "heavers at your state", attempting to undermine the authority of the crown.¹⁷⁷ The ground in the south-eastern corner of the orchard sloped away to the south, about thirty feet beyond "the foote of the wall"¹⁷⁸ of the basecourt and in 1564 the surveyor, Edmund Hall, recommended that this should be levelled by using the earth removed from the south garden. He further suggested that a wall from the round mount "of the south west corner of yor garden" should be built, and, though it is impossible to establish absolutely, due to the punctuation of the letter, it seems that this was to run westwards "to the water". This "wall" was to be made from more of the earth removed from the garden, which implies that Hall had a retaining wall in mind. There must have been a bank created at the far south end of the orchard where the newly raised and levelled ground met the original contours of the land. At this point, Hall advised, the ground of the orchard was "to be even with the height of the grounde adjoyninge upon the wall of yor base courte so as to make all that Angell levell".¹⁷⁹ The effect of the "wall" at the south end was probably more like a raised bank with a steeper drop on the non-garden side, similar to that Kemp described in November 1561.¹⁸⁰ "Thus being bolde to write to youe my minde", Hall concludes, "w^{ch} as I thinke shal be as well a beutifying to yor orcharde to geve it an even head before yor house, as to the beutifying of the growndes, next adjoyninge to the principall side of yor house to be even and levell".¹⁸¹ The grounds, in this case at quite some distance from the house, were being considered in aesthetic relation to it, and one part of the garden regarded in relation to another, not simply as separate and autonomous enclosed spaces (see Plan F7).

The impressive-sounding stone gateways Cecil proposed in 1561¹⁸² suggest a circulation route through the gardens and out into the dry close which was part of the park. Circulation is also implied by the item "Ye new way" from where a gate was to be removed, while instructions for the rough masons "to make my seates at ye iij trees"¹⁸³

indicates a sociable resting place en route, perhaps even in the park itself, as there was to be at Kenilworth by 1575.¹⁸⁴ A note of the distance of "3 miles and quarter of a furlong" measured round the garden at Theobalds by Cecil included a "close walke" encompassing an area beyond the formal gardens.¹⁸⁵

Thomas Thorpe's map shows a number of embrasures projecting into the park in the boundary of the garden and orchard area on the west side of the garden. The conventions used are simplifications of those shown on Treswell's map of Holdenby, and must similarly represent gateways or arbours, or both, leading to and looking out over the park and meadows beyond. Caldwell depicts two wide pillared openings in the west wall of the garden opening into the park. There is also an indication on Thorpe's map of a gateway leading from the south side of the forecourt into where the orchard must have been, which is the most likely site of the "portill" for the orchard listed in the Memorial (Plans F7, 24 & Fig. A.4).¹⁸⁶

At the far east end of the present north garden wall, there is a square-headed stone gateway with Doric pilasters and strapwork decoration flanked by obelisks overhead, which is stylistically compatible with Cecil's architecture (Fig 4.10). The design has similarities with decorative motifs used on the monument to his parents that Cecil erected in St Martin's, Stamford, and also with the obelisks on the roof balustrading at Burghley, while the scrolls are similar to the decorative volutes on the cresting above the south window of the great hall (Fig 4.11). It is comparable with a design for the outer gateway for Theobalds by John Symonds dated 1577 (Fig 4.12).¹⁸⁷ The 1623 map shows an outer gate at Burghley. The present siting of the Burghley gateway is beyond the limits of the garden even as shown by Haynes in 1755. Gates however were frequently moved as was that attributed to Nicholas Stone at Kirby, for instance,¹⁸⁸ and as discussed, even within the span of Cecil's building, the gate from the west terrace was re-sited.

What was probably the site of the mount "of the south west corner of your garden",¹⁸⁹ can be seen projecting from the angle on the south-west boundary of the gardens on the 1623 map. The garden boundary is shown running west from here towards the corner of the "Ponde yard" that covers about a third of an acre and the "Ponde close" of just over seven acres beyond, tallying with the "water" mentioned by Hall.¹⁹⁰ These most probably denote the ponds that were being dug in the winter of 1561. The size of the pond close and Waldstein's description of a "really fine fishpond"¹⁹¹ indicate as well an impressive stretch of water forming part of the landscape beyond the gardens. Elaborate groups of ponds and water gardens, already a feature of Henry VIII's royal gardens at Hampton Court,¹⁹² were to become a fashionable feature of later Elizabethan gardens, Theobalds probably being the most spectacular.¹⁹³ Several Northamptonshire gardens were almost as ambitious. A group of five tightly grouped rectangular ponds, whose outlines are still visible today, are shown on Ralph Treswell's 1587 map of Holdenby, and must have been part of Hatton's landscaping as they do not feature on the 1580 map (Fig. 4.8).¹⁹⁴ The remains of Tresham's huge "moated orchard" from the work at Lyveden begun in 1597 still exist. The canals here were also designed as fish ponds surrounding the area and its corner mounts.¹⁹⁵ In 1683 London and Cooke proposed to replace cherry trees "upon those degrees in ye pond garden".¹⁹⁶ The similarity to the Privy garden at Theobalds which had "26 cherry trees going east west and north of the said garden, lying 8 steppes high in ascent from the middle of the garden"¹⁹⁷ suggests the arrangement at Burghley very probably originated with William Cecil. The ponds at Burghley, identified on Haynes' survey as the "Two Stews" and the "Long Pond", approximate to the pond yard and part of the pond close of 1623 and together are over 100 yards (91.4m) long. Similar stretches of water in the landscape were frequently employed as an ideal vehicle for dazzling thematic drama in Elizabethan progress entertainments.¹⁹⁸

There is no sign of a mount in the south west, or of ponds beyond the garden, in Caldwell's engraving, but as Till points out, his accuracy cannot always be relied upon.¹⁹⁹ The mount at least had probably been swept away by George London before Tillemans

made his original drawing. Caldwell does, however, show the garden area to the south west of the house to be immaculately even, which suggests that Hall's recommendations for levelling the orchard were probably carried out. By 1755 one can certainly see the results of George London's work of the 1680s. London appears to have taken advantage of the levelling in the orchard, and no doubt of the high water table in this area that had made sixteenth-century planting so difficult, and flooded it to make the huge garden pond (Fig. A.6d).²⁰⁰

The South Gardens

The prospect to a Roman road with an ancient beacon on the skyline was a fortuitous bonus for a man so anxious to identify with the continuity and authority conveyed by antique origins, and it may have influenced Cecil's decision to develop the south range with its classical loggia overlooking the south garden as the principal orientation of the house.

As early as 1556 Warde thought stone quarried from within the garden too soft for using as steps for a terrace.²⁰¹ In February 1561 Kemp reported of the stone from the quarry at Burghley: "I do bestow amongst the south side of the garden the good earth which is but little I cast into the cooks garden the rubbish I lay xvij fote broad under the east wall and about the wall that parteth the cookes garden from the other garden".²⁰²

The fact that they were bothering to take out stone of poor quality from the garden quarry that then had to be "bestowed" elsewhere, and furthermore that only a small amount of good soil was extracted with it, implies that the stone was quarried from near the surface and was probably removed as much in order to lower the ground level as for the usefulness of the material. Cecil was obviously on the look out for sources of good stone on his own property, sited as it was in the heart of an area famous for the quality of its stone. "To search for a quarry in ye oake close"²⁰³ is on his list in the Memorial, and

while the stone within the garden itself was only suitable for rubble filling, that at Cliffe Park, was obviously high quality, being suitable for dressed stone for architectural members such as windows.²⁰⁴ In September 1556 he recorded, "there was digged 59 tone of freestone", charged at £7 a ton, and 9 ton of paving stone at £6 18s, from Cliffe Park²⁰⁵ while in the same month William Christopher was paid for two and a half days "drawying over of stone oute of the pytte 3s 4d."²⁰⁶ Cecil also made a note to organise carts to "bring home my stone from St. Peters" at Tinwell on his Memorial.²⁰⁷

By 1562 the stone-pillared open gallery or loggia faced onto the south garden with a bay-windowed belvedere at its centre. The drawing of the somewhat similar range that Cecil built at Theobalds in the 1570s facing west to overlook the great garden, is endorsed by Cecil "upright of the gallery garden".²⁰⁸ It is interesting that he should call the actual building the "gallery garden", implying that he may have intended these loggias for displaying some of his more tender and exotic plants but, above all, that he was thinking of the gallery range as integral with the garden (see Fig.2.11).

At Burghley the rapport between house and garden was similarly close. The views from the belvedere and the loggia on the ground floor were thought important enough to warrant carrying out extensive earth moving to ensure an unimpeded vista of the garden. As discussed, in May 1562 Kemp was proposing to lower the ground table in front of the house by 2 ft 6 ins (0.76m) "or els yo^r open galary wyll do yo lytle plesuer for at the present yo can skase standing wthin loke into the garden over the soyle of the bay window". In a letter a week later Kemp reassured Cecil that "the falling of the grond table" would not materially effect the appearance of the bay window.²⁰⁹

The vista from the house was therefore not only to be experienced from directly above, as a flat pattern resolving into a resemblance of embroidery (a frequent analogy in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries), it was also considered as a perspective view at eye level — a view that was organised to emphasise this perspective, in that the pathway

dividing the west from the east quarters must almost certainly have been on a direct axis with the belvedere in the centre of the south range.

The most obvious formal route from house to garden as shown on John Thorpe's ground-floor plan of Burghley would be on this axis, through the archway under the south courtyard pavilion which leads straight into the centralized belvedere of the loggia. The parade route through the house was similarly organised to create dramatic vistas (See Plan F1 & F2).²¹⁰ Caldwell depicts a pathway on this central axis and Hollar's bird's-eye view of Exeter House (formerly Cecil House) shows a similar central path from house to garden with a vista open through the mature trees at its far end (Fig 4.13).²¹¹

Thomas Thorpe's map shows a projection in the centre of the south boundary wall of the gardens which would have been on the axis of the belvedere, and again either implies a centrally organized vista out onto the landscape or, if this denotes an arbour, then a focal point to the perspective at the far end of the gardens.²¹² The view in the other direction, back to the house along this line, has the central pavilion of the south front as a focus, while the open loggia below would have given a much more animated and dramatic contrast of light and shade than the flattened barrier between house and garden that the present glazed archways present. 1561, the year before the view from the loggia was under discussion at Burghley, was when Throckmorton gave Cecil a copy of the 1560 edition of Jean Cousin's Livres de Perspective, so Cecil was obviously showing an interest in the subject, and the book demonstrates how to create the illusion of centrally organized spatial relationships that give the most spectacular effect.²¹³

Beyond the south boundary of the garden on Thorpe's map lie the "Degrees" (Plan 24). Thorpe gives no indication of land contours, but the name strongly suggests terracing in this area, where the ground rises towards the "forty foot way", for some sort of formal cultivation. The "Rosiarys" shown on Treswell's maps of Holdenby (Fig. 4.8a) are organised into flights of terraces, the outlines of which are still visible in the landscape.

The "Degrees" were beyond the garden at Burghley so this was probably for productive cultivation of some kind, possibly vines or hops.²¹⁴ In the eighteenth century there were vineyards at the south end of the gardens, shown on Haynes survey map of 1755 in which there is still some suggestion of terracing (Plan F8).

The design of the south garden was on the agenda in January 1562/1563. The two quarters on the east side being higher than those on the west side, Kemp was asking Cecil whether these should be made level. The rising ground on the east side of the site was causing problems in the garden just as it was within the house, but in Kemp's opinion the levelling would be very expensive and therefore "it wold do fayre inogh yf they lye as they dow".²¹⁵

The path that divided the Burghley gardens running southwards had a "gutter for y^e water to ronne downe y^e myds of y^e garden for y^e watering thereof"²¹⁶ which suggests a slight gradient in this direction. This was being laid down by 10th January 1562/1563 and must have been an open channel, of the sort recommended by Hill for irrigating and draining gardens: "the apteth and most laudable placing of a garden plot shall be, if the plain ground lying somewhat aslope, shall have a course of water running through ...and far better watering of all the heddes..lying still in the paths may [be] through a slope gutter made in the midst of them".²¹⁷ The gutter is not referred to as a "pipe" by Kemp, as the conduit bringing the water supply to the house is described. Nevertheless it was work to be undertaken by the plumber rather than by the ditching labourers, so was more sophisticated in intention than a standard ditch and almost certainly would have been lead lined, forming a narrow decorative canal of water running down the centre of the garden. London and Cooke's proposals of 1683 for "Draynes along each side ye Gravell walks in ye parter into ye canal 8 inches wide and 8 inches deep and no bottom of stone" would seem to be a similar sort of arrangement. The "Basson in ye parterre" mentioned in the same document was to be "done about with stone" with "a crest 6ins or 4 ins. above ye gravell"²¹⁸, which may also refer to the development of an earlier water feature in the

centre of the south garden like the fountains and other water ornaments particularly noted by visitors to Theobalds.

There is no mention of a fountain in the sixteenth-century correspondence relating to Burghley, but in November 1561 Kemp reported "for the water in the conduit howse when the plomer is come my advic is, y^t the pipe y^t comethe from the head, shall rune up by a poste tyll it come to the toppe of the howse, & there retorne down upon the mydest of the table".²¹⁹ Kemp enclosed a rather quaint "tryke" of his plan. Obviously a good deal of effort was being made to get a good head of water to supply the house if not provide pressure for a fountain. At Burghley in 1600, Waldstein noted "an interesting water supply system near the kitchen: the water comes from quite a long way off and is brought through pipes to a considerable height"²²⁰, which must refer to the arrangement proposed by Kemp or a development from it.²²¹ Similar trouble seems to have been taken at Theobalds where Waldstein recorded that an aqueduct brought water right up to the roof of the building.²²²

Despite Kemp's reluctance to undertake the levelling, thirteen labourers were nevertheless working in the garden in January 1562/3, which he reported "is a sore work".²²³ In February Kemp complained of the wind and rain and how "Yor garden thereupon is very tedious to bring to pass".²²⁴ As with the park, Cecil was eager to get on with the garden and was not laying off workers as one might expect, in the difficult winter months.

Kemp was willing to compromise the design in order to save money, and obviously the earthworks had not been properly undertaken by August 1564 when Edmund Hall made his report. He immediately instructed Kemp to measure the costs of the work of taking the garden to the "lowness of the flower in your lower gallery" by working on a five foot square test bed. The earth could not be used to infill the terraces as these were almost completed and the stonework of their walls all but finished. Hall, as mentioned above,

ingeniously proposed killing two birds with one stone by using the earth to level the orchard and, at the same time, "beutifying of the growndes next adjoininge to the principall side of yor house to be even and level". Furthermore he recommended that if the sides of the garden were still not equal in height, earth should "be caste downe" from "the higher parte . .to the lower parte wh^{ch} is no great chardge".²²⁵

Levelling of the quarters of the garden at Theobalds was similarly on Cecil's list of preparations for a visit by the queen in 1575.²²⁶ Contouring the land into ordered, even planes and regular elevations in the form of mounts and terraces was obviously considered an essential of these formal gardens, just as the architectural design of the house was to be clearly understood by the delineation and rational disposition of the members of its unified whole. Analogies with irregular land formations were employed as a punning foil for the virtue of the local inhabitants in an address to the queen on her visit to Sudeley Castle in 1592: "Your Highness comes into the Cotswolds, an uneven country, but a people that carry their thoughts levell with their fortunes, lowe spirites, but true harts; using plaine dealinge,..".²²⁷

Dividing a garden into four quarters, as Kemp's letter of 1561 makes it clear was the arrangement of the main south garden at Burghley, was an ancient practice, ultimately deriving from descriptions of Paradise divided thus by the four rivers, and it continued to be the most popular design for gardens throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It can be seen in plans and illustrations of many of the great French gardens including Fontainbleau, Blois and Amboise, and was adopted during Henry VIII's reign at most of the royal palaces.²²⁸ In many instances the design took the form of the square and cipher motif that combined the two ideal geometric figures of square and circle. Given that this pattern became almost the leitmotif throughout the house at Burghley, used on a large as well as a small scale, and furthermore, that the design mechanisms for house and garden were so closely related, it seems very probable that Cecil would have used the figure in the

garden. Hatton, perhaps following Cecil's lead once more, was to employ the design for his formal garden on the principal side of Holdenby in the 1570s and 1580s.

By October 1561 "the east wall of the terras in the garden" was "so heyh as the quarter yt is made of the garden".²²⁹ This must have run north south on either the east or the west side of the south garden. As Hall's report makes clear, by 1564 there was more than one terrace "alreadie set forth" in the south garden, and that these had retaining walls finished in stonework.²³⁰ The terrace floors appear to have been grassed over, as was the customary practice in the sixteenth century. In Cecil's memorial of 1561 he repeats the instruction "item, to clense ye terras and sowe it with hoydust [hay seed]".²³¹

He also itemized "to fell young trees for my terras",²³² again making use of his own resources and perhaps to make timber steps or frames for arbours which were sometimes incorporated into terraces. These were frequently constructed in "carpentry work", in the manner shown as a throne for Europa at the head of the title page of Ortelius' *Theatrum Orbis Terrarum* (1572), Cecil's Grangerized copy of which is still at Burghley (Fig.4.14). Like this illustration, the seats on the terraces at Burghley were to be made of stone for "to sett out ij sitting places in my terras walls" is on the Memorial under the work detailed for the rough masons.²³³ The creation of the gallery, banqueting house and terrace at Windsor in which Cecil was so closely involved, included stone seats built into a terrace wall. In 1574 the plain solid parapet of the wall of the terrace begun in 1572 were taken down and rebuilt "Cum edificiis et structuris vocatis Ballysters Buttresses cum sedibus."²³⁴ This work was an entirely outward looking addition to the old fortified castle, where the queen was perceived by Harrison to have "appointed huge sums of money to be employed upon the ornature and alteration of the mold, according to the form of building used in our days, which is more for pleasure than for either profit or safeguard."²³⁵

In Caldwell's engraving a two-tiered terrace with flights of steps at its northern end is shown on the east side of the garden and there is a seat set into or against the wall at the back of its upper level. This looks westward and commands a view over the whole south garden. The terrace is set higher than the garden boundaries to the west, so high in fact that it appears like an extended mount. This could be part of the work originally dating from Cecil's time (the Privy Garden at Theobalds had three-tiered "ascents").²³⁶ Caldwell shows a little banqueting house on the upper level of the east terrace, which may also be a survivor from the sixteenth century. On 26th May 1573 Kemp wrote to Cecil: "we must have the freestone for the house in the garden from Fotheringhay for so it will be best and cheaply done".²³⁷ Kemp also took delivery of lead from the chapel at Fotheringhay²³⁸ which might have been used for the same building if the illustrated flat-roofed banqueting house is the one in question. At Theobalds one of the garden houses was described as "built turret fashion",²³⁹ and as well as the beacon on the horizon, Waldstein may have caught a glimpse of this high-set little building within the garden at Burghley, reflected in the chimneypiece.²⁴⁰ In 1578 Richard Shute who was by that time Cecil's surveyor, reported that the masons were in hand "wth the crosse wall from the Sowth tower to the rounde there".²⁴¹ Caldwell shows the wall with the seat running behind the banqueting house, southwards to surround part of an area of even higher ground behind that can be seen above the top of the wall and which may represent the "rounde" (Fig.A.4).²⁴²

The present garden rises steeply into a substantial hill to the south east of the house, created by Capability Brown with spoil from the site of the lake. However, Haynes shows a large mount on his 1755, pre-Brown survey plan of the gardens and park. This is quite far to the east of the garden but it could indicate the high area of ground behind the terrace depicted by Caldwell. It is also in the proximity of the large projection, about 50 yards (45.7 m) wide, with circular corner bastions shown on the east side of the garden on Thorpe's 1623 map. Thorpe gives no indication of land levels and this may represent the same sort of configuration as the "Middle Garden" at Lyveden which displays the similar outlines in plan form and had two circular mounts at its southern corners (Fig.4.15) There

is a plan in the Hatfield collection with angle bastions for what looks to be a fortification, but which is entitled "for a place of pleasure".²⁴³ The vogue for these pseudo-fortifications has been interpreted as a nostalgic evocation of the medieval chivalric past.²⁴⁴ But they can equally be construed as a supremely self-confident, if not ironic, deconstruction of the fortified landscape. Cecil, as has been discussed, was thoroughly familiar with the construction of genuine military installations for coastal or border defence which by the middle of the sixteenth century were largely separated from domestic architecture.²⁴⁵ Machiavelli advised that only the prince who "is more afraid of his own people than of foreign interference should build fortresses" in the interior of his own country.²⁴⁶ Mock, if not mocking, toy defences at Burghley would have provided a blatant advertisement that an alternative form of controlling order was in operation within the nation, conveying a similar message to that evoked in the portrait of Cecil on his mule.

Behind where Caldwell shows the banqueting house terrace there was a bowling green, according to Haynes' survey. In 1679 the 5th Earl of Exeter was informed by the gardener that for the want of protective hedges, "at present ye bowling green and several other things runne to ruen"²⁴⁷ implying an established green. Cecil was fond of the game which was extremely popular in the sixteenth century, offering as it did the twin opportunities of competing and gambling, and it is highly likely that he would have installed this recreational amenity on the levelled ground at Burghley, just as he did at Theobalds.²⁴⁸ There were also a "Pheasant Garden" and a "Laundrie Garden" at Theobalds by 1650.²⁴⁹ Haynes survey of Burghley also shows a "Pheasantry" and a "Bleaching Ground" and these again may originally date from Cecil's gardens.

The East Garden

The gardens on the western approach side of the house and facing south on its principal side were obviously the most important areas of concern. However, if the alterations reported by Shute in 1578 were on the east side of the south garden,²⁵⁰ this

suggests a connection with the addition of the new Great Hall width on this side of the house which must have meant major changes to the east garden. In the early building phase this is the most likely position for the cook's garden, where they were bestowing the good earth, referred to by Kemp in 1561.²⁵¹ It would have been convenient to the kitchen in the north-east corner of the house, and protected from the north by the probable existence of a subsidiary court behind it.²⁵²

Garden and court must have been demolished in Cecil's later building phase starting in the mid-1570s when the east garden would have been upgraded. It would then have formed a private or privy side garden, hidden from view from the "forty-foot way" by the mount and from the main garden by the east terrace. The centralized porch of the symmetrically organized east front, as shown on John Thorpe's plans would have led from the screens passage into its midst.

The North Garden

There is no mention of gardens to the north of the house in the surviving documents, and as the north range was most probably the 'working' side of the house in the early phase of the building history at least, whatever garden was on this side would no doubt have been fairly simple in layout. When it became an alternative entrance to the west front in the 1580s it too must have been upgraded, and was flanked by service ranges on either side, forming a forecourt. Vanderbank's cartouche of the north front in the 1680s (Fig. A.2) shows a plain expanse of gravel with a pathway across it on an axis with the central entrance arch, leading to steps before the opening. Terrace walls or balustrades are shown across the whole front on either side. The efforts made to impose symmetry about the centre on this front in the later building phase, as well as the imposing nature of the frontispiece itself, make it reasonable to assume that by 1587 the approach across the forecourt on this side of the house would also have been centrally aligned.

Thorpe's 1623 map indicates areas to either side of the north service ranges that are enclosed within the garden area. To the north west was the "court of husbandry". The north east becomes the most likely place to re-locate the cook's or kitchen garden in the late 1570s or the 1580s. There was an established kitchen garden on the east side of the house by 1683, which, it appears from London and Cooke's proposals, was far enough to the north to allow for "an orange house" to stand in front of it to the south.²⁵³

The letter concerning the garden house in 1573 also mentions that "your mason is in hand with your porch",²⁵⁴ and confirms that attention to the architecture and the garden did not cease altogether in between the two most active periods of Cecil's work at Burghley. Nevertheless, the evidence available suggests that the plan of the garden, apart from the east side, remained fundamentally as it was conceived and laid out between 1556 and 1564. The increase in height of the building in the later building phase, capped by a huge flat roofscape, would have taken full advantage of the prospects to established gardens and maturing deer park beyond, planted and landscaped some fifteen to twenty years earlier.

Apart from Richard Shute's report there is a list of items in the household accounts for 1578, in which the expenses of the gardens at Burghley House and at Theobalds are given separately, and come to £11 19 s 2 d and £11 18 s 0 d respectively, including the purchase of fruit trees and seeds.²⁵⁵ This is such a surprisingly small sum in both cases that other monies must have been spent and recorded elsewhere, but there is no indication of any significant construction work.

The "extremely rich garden" at Burghley led the way for other splendid Northamptonshire gardens developed in the 1570s-1590s.²⁵⁶ In contrast to Burghley, Sladen comments of Kirby in the 1570s that "attention had been focused on the structure itself and little thought was spared for the external amenities and setting".²⁵⁷ It was not until Hatton took over at Kirby in the 1580s that it becomes obvious the garden was

developed as actively as the house. Elsewhere the rapid construction of Nonsuch that began in 1538 encompassed the simultaneous extensive remodelling of the surrounding area into a lavish man-made setting for the royal palace. There is no evidence, however, of the concept of a unified design being organised to provide visual as well as physical communication between building and garden from a ground-level perspective.²⁵⁸ The emphasis in projects such as this that pre-date Burghley is on the appearance of the two-dimensional pattern of the gardens, designed as independent figures with an arbitrary spatial relationship to the building, to be viewed from the windows above. Smythson's undated plan of Wollaton is the earliest known example in England in which the symmetrical rationale of the house spreads out to the design of its gardens on all four sides.²⁵⁹ But there are indications at Burghley, certainly on the west and south and later on the north sides, that the courts and gardens surrounding the house were designed to be axially aligned with the central features that were the climax of the architecture of each front.

To create an environment which appeared to be "more for pleasure than either profit or safeguard"²⁶⁰ might make a less overtly aggressive statement in the landscape than the mass of a fortified castle. Conceptually, however, it is a declaration of much greater confidence, or apparent confidence in one's power. It represents the "conquest" of the landscape rather than a defence against it. The flourishing gardens are no longer shut away, but look out to the visually open - but legally exclusive - park, advertising a form of artistic and scientific 'natural' control without the exercise of superior physical strength. The image is that of a peaceful, harmonious, well-ordered dominion, its wider surroundings naturalizing into the permanent geography; the reclamation of a pre-lapsarian state of grace or the reincarnation of the Golden Age. At the same time it also encompassed more entertaining prospects offering a variety of attractive and diverting amenities and equally varied scenery within which to set the programme of events for a royal visit. Though supported by the estate, the potential "profit" it was designed to yield was political rather than material.

-
- 1 Waldstein f.159 Ed. Groos 1981
 - 2 Camden Ed. Gibson 1971, 438 (Camden Ed. Gough 1780 Vol 2, 168)
 - 3 Sidney Ed. Evans 1977, 70 contrasting Arcadia with Laconia where civil strife had
"disfigured the face of nature and made it so inhospitable"
 - 4 Bacon Ed. Hawkins 1992, 37
 - 5 Strong 1979, 17
 - 6 A non-invasive archaeological survey carried out in 1993 suggests that, even
below ground, traces have virtually disappeared. (See Northamptonshire
Archaeology, February 1994.)
 - 7 Phibbs, J. paper 'The Assassination of 'Capability' Brown' given at Conference of
the Garden History Society and Association of Garden Trusts, 15 September 1994
 - 8 Gotch in Ed Barnard 1904, 51
 - 9 Hussey 1953, Pt I, 1828
 - 10 This was commissioned c. 1719 by Bridges for his History and Antiquities of
Northamptonshire which was not, however, published until 1791. The original
drawing is now lost.
 - 11 Jacques Ed. et al 1988, 30-34; Till 1991, 136-141
 - 12 T. Wright 1838 Vol I, 211, Cecil to Sir Thomas Smith, 16 October 1562
 - 13 Read 1955, 226
 - 14 Wright, L.B. 1962, 10
 - 15 Cal SP Foreign 1562, 1056, Cecil to Wyndebank, 16 November 1562
 - 16 Comito 1979, 19
 - 17 Henrey 1975, 28, their Stirpium adversaria nova published in 1570 or 1571, was
dedicated to Queen Elizabeth
 - 18 Henrey 1975, 3
 - 19 The book can be counted an original work, although Hill's publisher and friend,
Henry Dethick, covered himself by describing it in the preface as "gathered out of
the best approved writers of gardening, husbandrie and physicke" deemed worthy
to be printed because it was "so rare a comoditye to my country" (Hill 1587,
preface). It was published posthumously in 1577 under the pseudonym Dydimous
Mountain, and dedicated to Cecil by Dethick.
 - 20 Henrey 1975, 60
 - 21 In his Plus Excellent Bastiments de France, not published until 1576. See Rhode
1924, 14
 - 22 Henrey 1975, 63
 - 23 Though his reputation has suffered ever since accusations of plagiarism and
unscholarly inaccuracy were made in the early seventeenth century, modern re-
evaluation has acknowledged that he made a genuine contribution to the
understanding of plants and their cultivation in England. (Henrey 1975, 63)
 - 24 Gerard 1597, Frontispiece dedication
 - 25 Cicero De Senectute trans.Falconer 1971 Vol 20, 71
 - 26 Looper 1992, 263-264
 - 27 Gerard 1597, Frontispiece dedication
 - 28 Andrew Marvell The Mower against Gardens, in Ed. Woudhuysen 1992, 472
 - 29 Bacon, New Atlantis Ed. Johnston 1974, 241
 - 30 Hadfield 1985, 44

-
- 31 DNB 1975 Vol II, entry for William Turner, Vol 2, 2124
- 32 BL Lansdowne MSS, Vol 118, details of the journey in memo. in Cecil's hand and in Cecil's diary (no folio number)
- 33 DNB 1975 Vol II, entry for William Turner, 2124; & William Harrison Ed. Edelen 1968, 4
- 34 BL Lansdowne Vol 118 (no folio number)
- 35 SP Dom 11/9/57
- 36 For thirteen acres of oak to be sown for the crown in Windsor Park in 1580 (VCH, Berkshire Vol II 1907, 349)
- 37 Pettit 1968, 162
- 38 When Plum Park in Northamptonshire was enclosed in 1605, 516 trees were felled for paling, regardless of this concern. (Pettit 1968, 162)
- 39 Camden, see fn. 2
- 40 See for example SP Dom 12/20/37, also Appendix B, 4
- 41 In 1573, for instance, Kemp reported that he had caused "60 trees to be felled for you in the forest" which was very probably for impending building work (HMC Salisbury Vol 2 no 135. See Chapter 6 for more discussion of this) The keepers of the walks of Waltham forest were allowed twenty loads of wood a year, (MacCaffrey, 1961, 124) and Cecil was probably enjoying a similar sort of right at Cliffe Park in Rockingham Forest (BL Lansdowne Vol 30 f. 51) . Cecil also noted in the Memorial that trees were to be felled for planks for furniture and for use in the terraces.
- 42 Burgon 1839 Vol I, 428
- 43 Burgon 1839 Vol I, 428
- 44 Burgon 1839 Vol I, 429
- 45 Strong 1979, 38
- 46 See Appendix A, 9 & Appendix B, 4, discussed in detail below
- 47 Cal SP Dom 12/16/25. Waad was a friend of Cecil's and Clerk to the Privy Council during Edward VI's reign
- 48 Appendix B, 2
- 49 BL Lansdowne Vol 3, f.56
- 50 Sir Francis Carew was the owner of Beddington in Surrey (which Waldstein also visited), and where Carew artificially delayed the flowering of his cherry trees for a month to coincide with a visit from the queen (Plat 1608, 173-175)
- 51 Burgon 1839 Vol I, Appendix, 482-483
- 52 SP Dom 12/22/52
- 53 Burgon 1839 Vol I, Appendix, 483
- 54 More Utopia Ed. Surtz 1965, 120-121
- 55 HMC Salisbury Vol II, 255
- 56 Cal SP Foreign, 653 Thomas Cotton to William Cecil, 12 April 1579
- 57 Gerard 1597, entry for Martagon Lily
- 58 Girouard 1983, 113
- 59 Hoby Ed Powell 1902, 13
- 60 Hill Chap XIV Ed. Mabey 1988, 51
- 61 Comito 197, 10 quoting De Hortis Hesperidum in Pontano Carmina Ed. B. Soldati (Florence, 1902)
- 62 van Dorsten 1969, 551
- 63 Ben Jonson Hymn to Diana in Oxford Book of English Verse
- 64 Strong 1979, 46

-
- 65 Bullen, 1888, 303-20. Strong quotes from this (Strong 1979, 46). However Ashley 1970, 185-6, questions the claim made by John Payne Collier in 1833 that he had discovered an autograph MS Collier was a known forger and the MS was never produced and Ashley adds "The most recent editor (of Peele), David Horne, does not bother with them at all" and the attribution to Peele cannot be substantiated.
- 66 See above fn 12
- 67 Strong 1979, 46
- 68 Printed in Nichols 1823, Vol 3, 75. Chambers notes that "there is evidence that Burghley retired to "Colling's Lodge near Theobalds in grief at his wife's death in 1589, and also that in 1591, when he failed to establish Robert Cecil as Secretary, he made a diplomatic pretence of giving up public life" (Chambers 1961, Vol 4, 248)
- 69 The speech has been attributed to Robert Cecil, but Cecil was at the time concentrating all his political skills of handling the queen in order to manoeuvre Robert into his own former post of Principal Secretary.
- 70 Printed in Nichols 1823, Vol 3, 241-245
- 71 B. R. Smith 1977, 77 quoting Cicero in Those Fyve Questions, which Marke Tullye Cicero, disputed in his Manor of Tusculanum trans. John Dolman (London 1561) sigs. J4-J5
- 72 Report by the Crown Commissioners quoted in Rhode 1989, 69
- 73 In Cavendish's Life of the cardinal quoted in Strong 1979, 24 & 63
- 74 Andrew Marvell The Mower against Gardens, line 6 in Woudhuysen 1992, 472
- 75 Walpole Anecdotes of Painting in England Ed. 1849, 789
- 76 Ben Jonson To Penshurst, in Woudhuysen 1992, 421
- 77 See MacCaffrey 1961, 124 quoting A. Collins, Sidney Papers ii 162 "[Henry] Sidney was prepared to pay double the rent for Otford if he could have the hunting included"
- 78 Cal SP Dom 10/14/47
- 79 Read 1960, 316; SP Dom 12/172/37. Whether Leicester intended any provocation beyond the immediate meaning of the remark is not disclosed
- 80 SP Dom 12/20/37
- 81 SP Dom 10/10/12
- 82 Appendix A, 4
- 83 SP Dom 12/20/37
- 84 See Till 1991, 131
- 85 SP Dom 12/20/37
- 86 See fn.138 for explanation of warrant/warren
- 87 SP Dom 12/21/2
- 88 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 118, f.82
- 89 Taking a linear acre as four poles or twenty-two yards
- 90 SP Dom 12/21/47
- 91 For a definition of 'bochers' see footnote to Appendix B,2
- 92 Appendix B, 2 . 'Acre' must be used here as a linear measure as by 1561 the land belonging to Cecil surrounding Burghley totalled only just over 244 acres. (Exeter MSS E54/1) 401 acres would therefore mean a about one and a quarter miles length of planting, encompassing the various separate closes
- 93 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 103 f. 118. Report endorsed by Cecil as written on 12th December and received on the 18th. A Mr Lacy had supplied 17, an unknown quantity came from Eniley [?] and from a "stranger" another 28 chestnuts.
- 94 Exeter MSS E54/1

-
- 95 Walpole Ed. Wornum 1849, 800
 96 Harrison Ed. Edelen 1968, 255
 97 Erasmus Trans. Radice 1993, 60
 98 Mellows 1939 Vol I, xii
 99 Exeter MS E54/1
 100 RCHME 1981, 109
 101 Till 1991, 128
 102 Harrison Ed. Edelen 1968, 259
 103 Exeter MSS E54/1
 104 Shirley 1867, 35. Cecil certainly had breeding mares for in November 1557
 Abraham beseeched him to "let us have either the grey or baye mare to droll" for
 the mare already at Burghley, as Cecil added in the margin of Abraham's report,
 "it was not covered". (Appendix B, 2)
 105 See fn. 2
 106 Morton 1712, 148
 107 SP Dom 12/20/40
 108 BL Cotton MSS Titus B xiii f.173, 1566; Read 1955, 352. Cecil's grandfather had
 also entertained Henry VII's bastard son, the Duke of Richmond, here in 1532
 (Rowse 1960, 61)
 109 Erasmus in Trans. Radice 1993, 61
 110 Baschet Transcripts PRO 31/3/26, 137
 111 Ben Jonson Hymn to Diana (Oxford Book of English Verse)
 112 B.R. Smith 1977, 100 & Appendix 110
 113 Thurley 1993, 68-69
 114 Fuller in Freeman Ed. 1952 Vol I, 159. Wothorpe was built at the beginning of the
 17th century.
 115 Exeter MSS E57/7. The lodge is shown in plan in the form of a 'T' above a 'U'
 116 Philip Sidney Ed. Duncan-Jones 1990, 147
 117 Batey 1991, 8 quoting Markham's addition to Surfleet's translation of Liebault's
Maison Rustique published in 1616 where he is referring in particular to English
 parks
 118 Walpole Ed. Wornum 1849, 791-792
 119 Walpole Ed. Wornum 1849, 791-792
 120 Borsook 1973 18, quoting Bruni, L. Laudatio (Florence 1403-4)
 121 Bacon Ed. Hawkins 1992, 142
 122 Appendix A, 4 lns. 20-25
 123 Gotch in Ed Barnard 1904, 51
 124 Boorde Ed. Furnivall 1870, 234
 125 Sidney Ed. Evans 1977, 73
 126 Spenser The Faerie Queene Book II, Cant xii, v.58 Eds. Smith and de Selincourt
 1991, 136
 127 Fiennes Ed. Morris 1947, 68
 128 Bridges 1791, 587. Fine ash and elm trees were noted at Theobalds in 1603 see
 below (Nichols 1828 Vol 1, 136)
 129 Bridges 1791, 490
 130 Fiennes Ed. Morris 1947, 68
 131 Exeter MSS E 54/1 and see opening quotation of this chapter, Waldstein f.159 Ed
 Groos 1981, 113
 132 See fns 1 & 124
 133 Nichols 1828, Vol I, 136

-
- 134 See fn 1, 124 & 125
- 135 Bacon Ed. Hawkins 1972, 139
- 136 T. Wright 1838, Vol II, No 98 Hatton to Cecil (also printed in Nicholas 1847, 224) & Cecil to Hatton (Nicholas 1847, 125-6)
- 137 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 3, f.56
- 138 Till 1991, 128; Exeter MSS E31/44 & E31/47. At Theobalds John Thorpe's map of 1611 shows two similar avenues of trees other than those flanking the approach (BL Cotton Aug.1, i, 75 illustrated in Summerson 1959 Plate XXX)
- 139 Pevsner, revised Cherry 1973, 400.
- 140 SP Dom 12/21/2. "Cunnygrey" literally means grey rabbit (from L. cuniculus: a rabbit). It is interesting, however, that "warren" and "warrant" have the same Old French etymology and previously shared many meanings including not only notions of protection but also a 'warranted' right of keeping a ground for breeding rabbits and other game (See Chambers 20th Century Dict. 1964 Ed). This confirms the importance of these features in sixteenth-century parks and concords with Harrison's description of the "free warren requiring royal warranty (Harrison Ed. Edelen 1968, 259)
- 141 Bridges 1791, 490
- 142 Camden Ed. Gibson 1977, 438
- 143 Bridges 1791, 490
- 144 See fn 1
- 145 Walpole Ed. Wornum 1849, 808
- 146 See B. Smith 1977, 112-114
- 147 Baschet Transcripts PRO 31/3/26 f.132
- 148 Alberti Book IX Ch 3 Ed Leoni 1755, 189-190
- 149 See Harris 1995 for overview of the genre 15th to 20th century
- 150 Appendix A, 1, ln.12/13
- 151 See Ch. 2 and Appendix A,1 lns. 2-9
- 152 Appendix B, 4
- 153 Exeter E 54/1
- 154 The dovecote shown as at the centre of the eponymous courtyard at Theobalds would appear from the Hatfield MSS 143/27,28 plan to have been a decorative as well as a practical feature.
- 155 This does not appear on the plan of the court of husbandry, but this is not unexpected as the basecourt only features in order to locate this service court.
- 156 Appendix B, 2
- 157 Hill 1587, Ch. V, 8
- 158 Appendix A, 10, l.16/17
- 159 Appendix A, 1
- 160 Appendix B, 2
- 161 BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 103, f.118
- 162 Harrison Ed. Edelen 1968, 256
- 163 Rhode 1989, 69-70
- 164 Hill 1587, 22
- 165 Pliny Trans. Radice, 1969, 142
- 166 Marked on Hatfield MSS 143/27,28 "ye platt of the whole house and grounds of Tibalds". The "old orchard" is marked to the south east.
- 167 See below in this chapter for more discussion of this gateway
- 168 Cal SP Foreign 1561-1562, 491 September 10 1561
- 169 Appendix B, 4

-
- 170 Exeter E 54/1
- 171 Cal SP Dom, 12 January 1958, 11/12/19. Bailiff of the Lordship of Essendine, just north of Stamford was a Cecil office held by his father and passed by William to his younger son Robert (Rowse 1960, 61)
- 172 Appendix A, 3, 1.12
- 173 SP Dom 12/20/37
- 174 Hatfield MSS CP 202/108
- 175 Steane 1977, 398, HMC III, 1904, I, iii
- 176 Appendix B, 4
- 177 Strong 1979, 46
- 178 Appendix A, 9, ln. 32
- 179 Appendix A, 9, ln.36/37. Cecil must have decided to have a wall rather than a hedge between the base court and the orchard (see above & Appendix B,2)
- 180 Appendix A, 4
- 181 Appendix A, 9, 1.41-44
- 182 Appendix B, 4
- 183 Appendix B, 4
- 184 Robert Laneham 1575 Ed. Furnivall 1907, 4
- 185 Hatfield MSS Vol 143, 53. A similar document in Cecil's hand gives measurement "in the Collens" which was one of the manors; from the seat to the garden gate, circuiting through several walks and back again, was just over two and a quarter miles. (Hatfield MSS 143/51)
- 186 Appendix B, 4
- 187 Hatfield MSS Vol 143, 47
- 188 Sladen 1984, 146; recorded in a letter, BL Add. 29574 292
- 189 Appendix A, 9, ln.35
- 190 SP Dom 12/20/37
- 191 Waldstein f.159 Ed. Groos 1981
- 192 King's Works IV, 138
- 193 See Strong 1979, 53-56 & Andrews 1993, 129-149
- 194 RCHME 1981, 108
- 195 Steane 1977, 397-399. Gresham supplied Cecil with a consignment of carp*
- 196 Till 1991, 136 citing Exeter MSS 15/B/41
- 197 Andrews 1993, 140
- 198 See Nichols 1823 for numerous accounts, particularly Kenilworth 1575, Vol 1 485-523, and the Earl of Hertford's entertainment at Elvetham Vol 2, 101-121
- 199 Till 1991, 141
- 200 Till 1991, 136: Ex 15/B/41
- 201 Appendix A, 1, 1.20.
- 202 SP Dom 12/21/47
- 203 Appendix B, 4
- 204 Appendix B, 2
- 205 SP Dom 11/9/57
- 206 SP Dom 11/9/57
- 207 Appendix B, 4
- 208 Hatfield MSS Vol 143, 41 & 42
- 209 Appendix A, 6, 1.3/4 & Appendix A, 7, 1.16
- 210 This aspect of the house plan is analyzed fully in chapter 7

-
- 211 Thomas Cecil who was living at Burghley while he was building Wimbledon may have taken his inspiration for the east garden which was organised on a central axis with the house and faced by a loggia with a central entrance bay (see John Symthson's plan (illustrated in Brown, 1989, 31)
- 212 A similar even more pronounced feature at Theobalds can be seen on John Thorpe's 1611 map (BL Cotton Aug. i,75) interpreted by Andrews as a "look-out or loggia" (Andrews, 1993, 138)
- 213 Cousin 1560 (the book is not paginated). Lucy Gent uses the title page as the cover of Pictures and Poetry (Gent 1981)
- 214 Hops were certainly grown at Burghley for a "Hop Yard" is mentioned in the correspondence, and "hop poles" are on the list in the Memorial (Appendix B, 4), and Cecil had extensive vineyards at Theobalds (see Hatfield MSS 143/53, length of vine walk, for example)
- 215 Appendix A, 8, ln.15
- 216 Appendix A, 8, ln.21/22
- 217 Hill 1587 Ch. 23, 26
- 218 Till 1991, 136; Exeter MSS E 15B/41
- 219 Appendix A, 4, ln.7-10
- 220 Waldstein f.159 Ed. Groos 1981
- 221 The water supply indeed came from a distance, making use of the medieval "freres cundith" which Abraham reported in 1556 was approximately three-quarters of a mile from the house. (Appendix A, 2) It was fed from a spring whose head is still marked by a bollard on the Burghley Park Golf Course, just south of the path of Ermine Street.
- 222 Waldstein f.149 Ed. Groos 1981, 85
- 223 Appendix A, 8, ln.23
- 224 A memorial in Cecil's hand (SP Dom 12/27/11)
- 225 Appendix A, 9, ln.39/40
- 226 Hatfield MSS Vol 143/ 61, 2 May 1575
- 227 B. R. Smith 1977, 73 quoted from 'Speeches Delivered . . at Sudeley' rpt. in The Complete Works of John Lyly Ed. R. Bond, Vol I, 471-477 (The visit to Sudeley was in September 1592, although Lyly was probably not the author. The entertainment there is not listed under Lyly's works in Chambers, who merely notes that he has been the suggested author of "several anonymous entertainments and fragments of entertainments" (Chambers 1961 Vol 3 417)
- 228 Strong 1979, 31
- 229 Appendix A, 3, l.10/11
- 230 Appendix A, 9
- 231 Appendix B, 4. "Hoydust" is derived from the Dutch word "hoy" meaning "hay" and the custom of using sweepings from hay barns to provide grass seed.
- 232 Appendix B, 4
- 233 Appendix B, 4
- 234 St. John Hope 1913, 270 The former walls were not Acceptable to the Privy Council, (no doubt articulating the queen's wishes)
- 235 Harrison Ed. Edelen 1968, 226-227
- 236 Andrews 1993, 140
- 237 Hatfield MSS CP 202/108, 26 May 1573. This was second-hand material allocated to Cecil when the chapel at this royal property was demolished in 1573
- 238 HMC Salisbury Vol 2, No 135
- 239 Andrews 1993, 141
- 240 Waldstein f.159 Ed. Groos 1981

-
- 241 Appendix A, 10, ln.14
- 242 It is unclear to what this "Sowth tower" refers but if the banqueting house is itself the tower then it would conceal a cross wall behind. Caldwell does not show any walls at the north end of the terrace where Shute was to set up "before the house" the other half of the gate to that "almost sett up" in the "crosse wall". Haynes' view does, however, show similar terracing with a wall running from the south front of the house across the northern end of the terrace where this northern gate could have been. (Fig. A.4 cf. A.6a)
- 243 Airs 1975, 3, Hatfield collection, BL Facsimile 372 (i);
- 244 For example, Girouard 1983, 205-233
- 245 The closeness which there could be over matters of gardening and military installations is illustrated by a letter to Cecil in 1561 from Armagil Waad reporting on orders given to Cecil's gardeners and at the same time recommending someone for the works at Dover and Sandwich who had a new method of excavating (SP Dom 12/26/25)
- 246 Machiavelli trans. Bull 1961, 118
- 247 Till 1991, 135; Exeter MSS E51/8/5
- 248 See for example HMC Salisbury Vol 7, 293-4, description of Cecil in the gardens at Theobalds in a letter from Michael Hicks to Sir Robert Cecil August 9 1597. A Bowling Green is marked on a plan of Theobalds garden annotated by Cecil (Hatfield MSS 143/37 & 38)
- 249 Andrews 1993, 138
- 250 Appendix A, 10
- 251 SP Dom 12/21/47
- 252 There was also a large cook's garden on the east side at Theobalds (Hatfield MSS 143,39)
- 253 Till 1991, 138, citing Exeter MSS E 15/B/41. There was also a kitchen garden on the west, which as Till proposes, may have been associated with the 'Housekeepers Close' shown on Thorpe's 1623 survey plan (Plan 24) (Till 1991, 138
- 254 Hatfield MSS CP/202/108
- 255 Read 1956, 345; Hatfield Box G 16
- 256 Waldstein, opening quote of this chapter. At Kirby, Holdenby, Rushton and Lyveden for instance (see Steane 1977) and in the early 17th century Thomas Cecil's new garden at Wothorpe
- 257 Sladen 1984, 141
- 258 Strong 1979, 38-39
- 259 Illustrated in Brown 1989, 29
- 260 William Harrison Ed. Edelen 1968, 226-227

ARCHITECTURE AT BURGHLEY HOUSE:
THE PATRONAGE OF WILLIAM CECIL
1553-1598

VOLUME 2

Contents:

	Page
Chapter Five "Beautiful Scenery": The Courtyard as Stage	201
Chapter Six Metamorphosis: The House of Burghley: Part 1 1573-1588	247
Chapter Seven "Its Purpose is its Use": The House of Burghley & Conclusion Part 2 & Conclusion	313
Bibliography	355
Appendix A	400
Appendix B	411

CHAPTER FIVE : "BEAUTIFUL SCENERY": THE COURTYARD AS STAGE

By the late 1570s important visitors reaching Burghley House by the ceremonial western approach through the park would have been formally greeted at the great gate-tower, the climax of the west front of the house. This traditional symbol of protective might was translated into a triumphal arch at ground-floor level. Instead of being surrounded by a formidable screen of masonry, it was part of an elevation that was as much glass as wall. While the architecture pays tribute to long standing tradition in the lofty octagonal turrets of the gate-tower and corner pavilions, the overall impression is re-oriented from one of physical defence to one of victory, celebrating the arrival of the honoured guest who came to enjoy a place designed "Rather for pleasure than for battery or fight" (Fig. 5.1).¹

As the new arrivals passed through the triumphal arch the presence and status of the owner-host was precisely plotted overhead. In the tierceron-vault of the entrance passage, Cecil's full achievement forms the centre-piece. In the surrounding compartments are the individual shields with the arms of his forebears and the Cecil arms of the members of his immediate family impaled with those of their spouses, all of them advertising the wider family connections. In the north-eastern segment is Cecil's personal declaration of mastership "W DOM DE BURGHLEY 1577" (Figs 5.2, 5.3, 5.4). The thirteenth-century owner of the manor had been William de Burgh. Given Cecil's eagerness to associate himself with ancient lineage, the similarity in the manner in which he styled his title was not perhaps incidental, nor possibly was it mere coincidence that Cecil had called his eldest son Thomas, the same name as that of de Burgh's heir.

At Theobalds the tradition of offering hospitality at the door was ostentatiously provided inside the gate-house by a vessel in the form of a bunch of grapes. From this, Waldstein was told on his visit in 1600, "when the Queen is present they draw white wine from one part of it and red wine from another"²; thus establishing from the very opening of

a visit the mutually rewarding host-guest relationship where 'nothing is too good for my guest' and 'only the best will be offered here'. In Spenser's critique of the provision of such sensuous luxury offered as hospitality in the "Bower of Bliss", the opening delight with which "Pleasure's porter" sought to seduce the virtuous was a "Mighty Mazer bowle of wine... Wherewith all new-coming guests be gratified."³ When Northumberland had visited Cecil and his father at Burghley with his huge retinue in 1552, he too took hospitality in the form of "wine at the door".⁴ The welcoming ceremonies were an important element in the elaborate structure of progress rituals where material gifts were offered, and the theme devised for the entire visit might be introduced, as happened at Kenilworth in 1575 and Bisham in 1592, for instance.⁵

Whether or not expectations were raised at Burghley by some such device as marked the ceremonial entry point at Theobalds, they must have been aroused on gaining the courtyard. As North was to remark, "when the new appears upon the entry to the principall quarters of enterteinment it is surprising and accepted with extraordinary satisfaction."⁶ The passage under the entrance arch marked the transition from one state to another, from that of outsider to privileged insider welcomed into the inner sanctum of the elite territory, and the nature of the architecture beyond changed accordingly. The context within the courtyard is no longer that of the Northamptonshire landscape which forms a backdrop to the totality of house, surrounding gardens and park, but the man-made and man-controlled environment whose context is itself, where the wall architecture is encountered inside-out simultaneously with the space that it enclosed (Fig A.6e). In the sixteenth century, the architecture would also have been seen from the inward-facing windows throughout the first-floor parade route of the interior of the house and in consequence would have been a far more pervasive presence in the experience of the house than that of the outward-facing fronts.

The plain astylar architecture of the exterior gives little indication of the richly articulated inward-looking elevations that could only be observed by the host's invited and,

according to the rules of hospitality and its acceptance, captive audience; a new form of political rather than military hostage-taking. Progress visits were not an optional extra in the court calendar. As Cecil wrote to Henry Sidney in Ireland in June 1566, "contrary to the appetite of the court" the queen was determined to make her progress to Northampton during July and August.⁷

The different rhetorical style adopted in the courtyard architecture is of a dialectic exclusively engaged within the imported culture of the sixteenth-century court. From the point of view of this corporate entertaining the courtyard provided an essential architectural and spatial dimension, and one which thus provides a rationale for the continuation of the courtyard in a new context from that of its medieval predecessors. The courtyard in Alberti's view was the "principal Member" of the house "being in a manner a publick market place to the whole House.... For this reason every one desires to have his Courtyard as spacious large, open handsome and convenient as possible"⁸ In the house of a prince moreover, there should be an open area, "big enough to receive the train of an Ambassador"⁹ At Burghley this space was designed for entertainment events as well as social assembly and as is clear from Haynes' view, from the moment of entry the dramatic focus of the architecture was located at its eastern end (Fig A.6e).

The sixteenth-century courtyard space at Burghley measured approximately 115 ft x 80 ft (35 m x 24.5 m), large enough to receive a substantial embassy. It is now subsumed behind John Gandy Deering's corridors, constructed between 1828-33 (Plan F3 - 041, 042, 044 & 046).¹⁰ On the north and south sides of the courtyard these extensions which measure 9 ft (2.8 m) across, align with the fronts of the pavilions, of which the open-arched ground-floor loggias shown on John Thorpe's plan are now glazed. At the east and west ends also, the once open loggia bays have been altered and glazed.¹¹

The Gandy Deering corridors render the courtyard a more claustrophobic area, not only by reducing both ground and air space, but by blocking the referred light through the

windows on either side of the originally single width ranges (already partially stopped up in the seventeenth century). They also suppress the previously plastic character of the architecture with its projecting pavilions in the centre of the north and south elevations, and the strong contrast of light and shade that open loggias create. Thorpe also shows the columnation of the north and south pavilions continuing over the wall faces to either side, and there is no reason to doubt that this was so. At the same time the corridor boxings disrupt the Elizabethan elevations and the rhythms of the sixteenth-century architecture in which the fundamental proportions derived from the orders, defined horizontally by the architraves marking the divisions between floors (Fig 5.5). Although the orders themselves were overtly expressed only throughout the ground floor of the courtyard the underlying unity of its proportional system was further emphasised by the consistency of its French-inspired Renaissance architecture.¹²

Not only was the sixteenth-century courtyard more ordered and expansive, certain of the messages it was designed to convey were equally more clearly signalled. Constructs concerning the ideas of time, permanence and continuity, projected into both past and future, are central to the meaning of both architecture and iconography. By the time its ultimate climax, the great clock tower, was completed in or soon after 1585, its whole form on one symbolic plane was a monument of the Cecilian dynastic foundation. On the ground-floor level there are discrete references to Trojan ancestry in the form of classical medallions of Aeneas and Paris, contained within the architectural language that derived from Rome, the city which Aeneas was traditionally believed to have founded. At the upper level, the lion supporters of the Cecil arms appear like flying buttresses, simulating a genuine architectural role as supporters of the whole edifice. They display unequivocally their male virility, signifying the strength of the Cecil line to perpetuate itself. They flank the clock where time, in the form of the clock hands, passes over the immutable arms of Cecil carved in stone, which form its face (Fig 5.6). The dial is surrounded by the Garter in the manner of Royal Arms, a coveted entitlement of the members of the prestigious Order into which Cecil was invested in 1572, "than the which

there is nothing in this land more magnificent and stately" as Harrison described it in 1586.¹³ Above is the great spire or obelisk, ancient symbol of both eternity and royalty, as illustrated on the opening page of Whitney's A Choice of Emblemes published in 1586 (Fig 5.7). Twined about with ivy, this signified the strength of the sovereign in combination with a loyal Church,

"and while thou raighnt,
oh most renowned Queene . . .
By thie supporte . . .
my blossome shall be green."¹⁴

A sentiment which could just as aptly be applied to William Cecil.

The framework of the Burghley tower forms a visual conceit as indicative of Cecilian permanence as the Medici motto sempre. Although a more subtly expressed glorification than that of Vasari's contemporary painting of the Apotheosis of Grand Duke Cosimo de Medici, its significance was couched within a semantic system that would have been clearly understood by a cosmopolitan court audience in the sixteenth century. The power the obelisk totem could assume within European culture at this time was clearly demonstrated in 1586 when Pope Sixtus V annexed the obelisk, over a hundred feet in height, first erected in Rome by Augustus as the symbol of imperial supremacy, and originally plundered from Egypt. In its new position immediately in front of St. Peter's its meaning was once more subverted to signal the ascendancy and permanence of papal power. Dragging the obelisk across the city was in itself a heroic feat, equally flaunting the replacement of imperial power by papal authority within the city. The great event was recorded and widely broadcast in a series of engravings.¹⁵ On a second symbolic plane the iconography of the tower at Burghley encoded a counter message - the rival British claim to Imperial power, transcending that of the Papacy.¹⁶

The richness, unity and classicism of the courtyard architecture all contribute to the atmosphere of established success which is still apparent from Haynes' eighteenth-century

view (Fig. A.6e). Since Cecil began introducing French features at the very start of his building work in 1556 and the date above the clock tower face is 1585, this single-minded style makes dating and chronological sequence very difficult to establish. This is further hindered because so much of the fabric of the sixteenth-century architecture is suppressed behind Gandy Deering's work. There is very little documentary evidence to help, and one has to rely largely on circumstantial evidence to plot the most likely course of its evolution.

The courtyard must already have been the centre-piece of Cecil's ambitious first phase of building, with a strong possibility that its hall porch tower was flanked by an open classical loggia, in keeping with that known to be on the south front. The dimensions of the quadrangle that were established in Cecil's first building phase appear to have been retained, just as he was to retain the dimensions of the original courtyard of the new house at Theobalds despite the many stages of its aggrandizement.¹⁷ Part of what can be seen in Haynes 1755 view, and even of what survives today may therefore originate or have evolved from the first building phase.

There are some stylistic details which may give clues as to dating.¹⁸ The soffits of the first-floor arches of the courtyard pavilions and east frontispiece differ quite significantly from those of the entrance arches of the north frontispiece, bearing the date 1587 on the cresting of its balustrade. Those of the north frontispiece however are almost identical in treatment to the barrel vaults of the Roman stair (analysed in detail below) which can also fairly confidently be dated to the 1580s. In the courtyard the Cecilian and Tudor emblems advertise their heraldic status in the traditional manner on shields, each one contained within an individual square of coffering, as though pinned to the surface of the wall (Figs 5.8, 5.9). On the stairs and north entrance, similar motifs are equally clearly defined but they are assimilated in a much more sophisticated, design-conscious and classicizing manner framed within the square and cipher pattern which is such a ubiquitous feature at Burghley (Fig 5.10). The more traditional design of the courtyard arch soffits would not necessarily imply that they date from the first building phase, as the apparently

"Gothic" nature of the heraldic west entrance vault of 1577 testifies. But this vault was in the area of transition from one environment to another and not an integral part of the more cosmopolitan atmosphere of the courtyard. Here the relative naïvety of the soffit design does suggest an earlier stage of stylistic development when the square and cipher motif may already have been introduced but was not yet fully appreciated as a co-ordinate of the architectural design.

The argument for an early date for these first-floor features, possibly at the end of the first building phase, is further supported by the similarities between the north and south pavilions and the frontispiece and lateral bays on the Strand front of Somerset House (1547-52) as shown in John Thorpe's elevation (Figs 2.12, 5.11a).¹⁹ These include triumphal arches, medallions, balustrades and strongly emphasised architraves on the bays marking the divisions between the floors. Above all, the alternating square and cipher panels and shell-headed aedicules of the elaborate balustrading at Burghley are lifted almost directly from those shown on the lateral bays at Somerset House, even down to the fireballs on their little pedestals in between. Pyramidal finials which may have existed are also sketched in by Thorpe on the balustrading between the bays of the elevation drawing.

Another early source illustrating the square and cipher motif, as well as a triumphal arch flanked by paired columns with niches in between, in the manner of the east end courtyard frontispiece, (though without the correct hierarchy of orders which this displays), was the publication by Cornelius Grapheus (Antwerp, 1550) of the triumphal scheme for the Entry of Charles V and Philip II of Spain into Antwerp in 1549 (Fig 5.12). Again the architecture is in the Franco-Flemish 'severe' style, and Cecil may well have come across this popular source when he was in Antwerp in 1555.²⁰

If the north and south pavilions do date from phase one of Cecil's building work, they would have had to be partly dismantled and altered when sloping roofs on these ranges were replaced by flat leads above a second storey, as is proposed happened

between 1575 and 1587.²¹ One can see how the original arrangement might have appeared by comparison with a similar pavilion built onto the outward-facing front at Ecoen. Built for Anne, Duke of Montmorency c.1553 almost certainly by Jean Bullant, it rises through three floors to above the level of the springing of the sloping roof, and is flanked by "lucan" windows (Fig 5.11b).²² Unlike the courtyard pavilions at Burghley this structure is not expressed as consistent with the divisions of the floors of the main block of the range behind (Fig 5.13a). The Ecoen pavilion nevertheless demonstrates the manner in which the first-floor arches of the central pavilions at Burghley could have related to the roof of the main body of the house before the insertion of an upper floor. Particularly so if one imagines the upper storey replaced by a full entablature, which is a quite possible proposition as a full entablature already existed on the south front loggia by 1562.

The dominant feature at Ecoen and Burghley is the central window or arch, which breaks through the entablature above the flanking windows, at Burghley in an almost Serlian form. Bullant was to repeat the motif in a more exaggerated manner at the Petit Château built for Montmorency at Chantilly c.1560 (Fig 5.13b). The fully fledged Serlian motif - first illustrated in Book Four of *Tutti le Opere d'Architettura*, (Venice, 1537 and Antwerp, 1539) - was not to appear in England until Inigo Jones introduced it in the Queen's Chapel at St James's Palace in the 1620s, but even so one can see similarities between designs by Jones of 1619 and both the Burghley and the Ecoen pavilions. (Fig 5.14).²³ The precocious suggestion of this form at Burghley is a new departure from the Somerset House bays but, as with the introduction of the south loggia, experimenting with this avante-garde feature is quite feasible for the first building phase.

The central bay of the ground-floor pavilion at Ecoen, meanwhile, is divided into two by a central pillar, a feature that was also present in the centre bay of the south outward-facing loggia at Burghley as shown on Thorpe's plan, where indeed the ground floor and most probably the first floor, originated in the first building phase. The same

double-bay feature is also illustrated in one of the châteaux designs in du Cerceau's collection of engravings that were in circulation by 1545, (Fig 2.13b)²⁴ and Bullant kept to a similar ground-floor arrangement in the later courtyard frontispieces for Montmorency at Ecouen.

Further similarities with Ecouen can be seen by comparison between the engraving of Bullant's now destroyed entrance frontispiece (c.1555-60) and the lower stories of the east end frontispiece at Burghley (Fig 5.15), and it is virtually certain that Cecil would have known of the architecture of Ecouen in some detail well before du Cerceau's illustrations of it were published in the mid 1570s.²⁵ Montmorency was something of an Anglophile, at least when it was politically convenient. He had been distinguished by Henry VIII with the Order of the Garter, and in the early 1560s, when he was to become a close friend of Thomas Smith, he was also a covert supporter of the French Protestants and their English friends.²⁶ Many of these English Protestants were also members of Cecil's circle who had been Marian exiles on the Continent when he visited Europe in 1555. Following the accession of Elizabeth, in 1559 parallel diplomatic embassies were entertained in England and France to ratify the Treaty of Chateau-Cambrésis. From France, Throckmorton wrote to Cecil who was organising the hospitality to be offered to the French party in England, headed by "Young Montmorency".²⁷ Throckmorton described his visits to Montmorency senior at Chantilly and Ecouen where they "dined and had great cheer at the Constable's charges", and advised Cecil concerning what reciprocal honours and entertainments should be laid on in England.²⁸ The ambassadors' official report makes it clear that they had been given a guided tour of Chantilly, and also Ecouen, "a princely house of the Constable's and worth the seeing."²⁹ The Constable had taken care to ensure that all the niceties of diplomatic hospitality were attended to, including the setting up of the Royal Arms of England at the house and at their lodgings. On their way back to Paris the delegation were also taken on a sight-seeing trip to St Denis to see the royal tombs, which by that time included Francis I's lavish monument by de l'Orme and Bontemps.

Montmorency was one of the greatest European patrons of the arts of the sixteenth century and it is known that Thomas Smith was at Ecoen in 1563 when the French court was there.³⁰ The duke had an outstanding collection of antiquities, and like Cecil, was a keen numismatologist.³¹ His interest in architecture was as scholarly as Smith's and Smith was to take the designs for his subsequent wall paintings at Hill Hall from the same source as a cycle of similar paintings at Ecoen.³²

Cecil's two most important architectural informants, Throckmorton and Smith therefore both knew Ecoen first-hand. Smith was known to be a practised draughtsman. He bought drawing instruments while he was in France and would have been capable of giving some sort of graphic as well as verbal account of the architecture he had seen.³³ Printed information about important buildings like Ecoen may also have been disseminated more widely and readily than is sometimes assumed. In 1569 for example (and almost certainly on Thomas Gresham's initiative), prints of the new Royal Exchange were made available with text in French, Dutch, Latin and English, so a wide circulation was obviously anticipated.³⁴

Undoubtedly, Cecil would have been intensely interested in what Montmorency was doing at any of his great châteaux, designed, like his own mansions, to act as quasi-public buildings to cater for the entertainment of embassies and the court. It is hardly surprising to find him appearing to take his line from a source that operated within such similar terms of reference to his own buildings, culturally and politically.

There is no record of building continuing in the first phase of Cecil's architecture after Hall's report of 1564, but it seems very likely that work continued up to 1566, which would be a very feasible time for the building of the pavilions if these followed on from a first phase development of the porch frontispiece and classical loggia at the east end. A letter from Sir Henry Percy to Cecil in 1566 enquiring whether he should send stone from Gisborough Priory in Yorkshire to Burghley or to London suggests that Cecil was still

regarded as involved in building at Burghley.³⁵ In 1564 Cecil made the substantial outlay of £1,600 for the principal fee farm of the Manor of Theobalds which included the existing moated house, but according to his accounts, significant expenditure on new building work did not get under-way until 1567.³⁶ The queen called upon Cecil there in July 1564, but at this stage Burghley was by far the greater house and already in an advanced state of modernisation according to Cecil's taste and aspirations. It would have been the more impressive of the two properties to the queen and court at this period.

The progress visit to Northamptonshire which was bound to materialise sooner or later duly came in 1565. Although she dined at Cecil's house the "Grey Friars" in Stamford,³⁷ there is no record that the queen went to Burghley, which suggests that major building work may still have been in progress at the main house.³⁸ Burghley was, however, on the agenda for the 1566 visit. By February that year, the Royal Works were busy at Collyweston - where Cecil was still steward - in anticipation of the queen's coming. It was put in good repair and up-dated with a fashionable new garden banqueting house with a stone stairway.³⁹ Similarly, dilapidated lodgings at Fotheringhay Castle were repaired, a bridge built leading into the park, and at both royal properties galleries were refurbished.⁴⁰ In June Cecil wrote to Henry Sidney,⁴¹ anxious because his neighbour, the Lord Admiral Clinton, also a keen architectural patron, was already at his house at Sempringham "preparing great things for the same", while he could not get away from court. Nevertheless Cecil declared, he would "not thereby spare my purse" and he had obviously braced himself to put on a good show.⁴² A courtyard sporting features in the latest French Renaissance style, taking up ideas evident in recent developments at the Constable of France's showpiece châteaux, which a number of English courtiers had already seen, is certainly a possibility by the Summer of 1566.

A further progress in the immediate future following that of 1566 was less likely, and for the next five years from 1567 Cecil does appear to have concentrated entirely on Theobalds. It is not until 1573 that a surviving letter from Kemp once again advises of

building work at Burghley.⁴³ On May 26th he informed Cecil that "your mason is in hand with your porch so speedily as he can".⁴⁴ There is no indication in the letter of where this porch was located, but at this stage of the development of the house there is no obvious position for what might be thus described, other than in the courtyard.

Two years after he had taken the title "Baron of Burghley" and following his appointment as Lord Treasurer and his investiture as a Knight of the Garter, Cecil might be expected to be re-opening the building campaign at Burghley. A new great hall for his "principal"⁴⁵ house, from which he now took his title would be a fitting gesture. He had after all, recently completed the hall range at Theobalds with its "stone gallery" loggia in front, also almost certainly imported from Henrick in Antwerp, which in turn may have developed from the pattern of one already installed at Burghley.⁴⁶ An equivalent further development of the ceremonial entrance leading to the great hall at Burghley would have been a logical step in this process. The evidence at both Theobalds and Burghley points to Cecil's methodology being one of radical evolution rather than revolution, to "reform" rather than demolish the existing fabric wherever possible.⁴⁷ Masons with experience in the Royal Works must have become highly skilled at splicing new work into existing in this manner as so much of the work on royal buildings was of this nature.

There is no record of the building expenditure at Burghley for 1573 when Cecil was also building a garden house,⁴⁸ but spending at Theobalds was down from £2,700 in 1571-2 to £1,600 in 1573-74⁴⁹ so he may have been spreading his resources between the two houses in the latter period. Peter Kemp had been seconded to help out at Theobalds for the queen's visit in 1572,⁵⁰ so by 1573 the man in charge of administering the building work at Burghley would have had first hand experience of Cecil's latest architecture and how it functioned as a hospitality centre for the court.

If one looks once more to the activity in the neighbourhood, a building boom in the area was well underway by 1573. At Deene Park Sir Edmund Brudenell began building

the present great hall in 1571 and its classical porch bears his arms and those of his first wife who died in 1572.⁵¹ Sir Humphrey Stafford began work at Kirby Hall in 1570,⁵² and the first Lord Compton at Castle Ashby in 1574.⁵³ Lewis, 3rd Earl Mordant moved to Drayton House in 1571 where he was to keep up a very grand household. Although the only date on the building from his period of occupation is 1584,⁵⁴ the likelihood must be that he started improving and enlarging the medieval house to establish himself in Northamptonshire - as he already was in Bedfordshire - when, or soon after he settled at Drayton. The Spencers were enlarging Althorp c.1573 and above all, Sir Christopher Hatton's Holdenby, acknowledged by him as taking Cecil's architecture at Theobalds as a model, was started some time after 1570.⁵⁵ While William Cecil was no longer living at Burghley, Thomas Cecil, heir to his title, was firmly established there and, as his correspondence with his father testifies, was as intent as he upon promoting the prime position of the Cecils in what must by this time have been a highly competitive county.⁵⁶

The fact that Kemp refers specifically to "your mason" working on the porch in his 1573 letter may be an indication of its high status. At Longleat, for instance, Chapman was recorded as working on the three-storey porch tower for the great hall for two hundred days in 1555-6 so the important work must have been largely carried out by this individual mason who was much sought after by the patrons themselves, rather than merely hired by their agents.⁵⁷ Furthermore, as mentioned above, the mason acting as a consultant at Fotheringhay in 1573 is referred to in the papers of the Royal Works in similarly personal terms as "Haward my Lo. Treasurer Masson".⁵⁸ Haward was advising on the bridge, which, at a cost of £180, was a quite important structure which bore an inscription advertising that it was erected by (i.e. for) the queen. He was also advising on moving the royal tombs, although there is no record of payment for the pair of new classical tombs designed to re-inter the second and third Dukes of York, whose earlier monuments the queen had found in a dilapidated state on her progress in 1566.⁵⁹ The tombs are of high quality with paired Corinthian columns to either side. The shields of these important forebears of the queen are contained within elaborate framed panels with

motifs echoing work at Fontainebleau. But, as is characteristic of the architecture throughout Burghley, there is no rich surface decoration to obscure, rather than define the architectural outlines of the tombs, in what could again be termed the 'severe' Renaissance style (Fig 5.16).

If at least part of the porch frontispiece was built c.1564 in a form similar to that which survives today, then one would expect the work of 1573 to have been concentrated on remodelling or re-building its upper part. Almost certainly this would have been as least as high as the third storey, in the manner of the courtyard frontispiece of Anet or the château entrance at Ecoen, particularly as the entrance range at Burghley was itself three storeys high, and the new great hall was to be even taller. A drawing endorsed by Cecil, for the "inwd. syde of the gatehouse. voyd" gives an idea of the architecture Cecil was contemplating for a courtyard centre-piece (albeit for a two-storey entrance screen) at about this time (Fig 5.17).⁶⁰ Like the Ecoen entrance frontispiece and the courtyard frontispiece at Anet which stood opposite the triumphal entrance arch, the central feature has arches flanked by paired columns on two floors (Fig 5.18). Various medallions are shown and an upper tier is formed by a balustrade with the recently acquired Cecil crest with its lion supporters above.⁶¹ The porch tower frontispiece at Holdenby as shown on the sketch of its ruin, as one would expect of a house modelled on Theobalds, displays many of the same features, and this had three complete storeys. Like Burghley, it originally had a window at third-floor level, and similar open loggia arcades on either side (Fig 5.19).⁶²

There is no documentary evidence to confirm a link between Cecil's mason, Haward, and either the design or execution of the tombs or the porch at Burghley. All one can say is that the porch frontispiece at Burghley is an altogether a bolder architectural statement than that of the local porches at Deene or Dingley, although Kirby, where there are signs of the influence of Burghley, and furthermore as mentioned above, where the same masons may have worked, also displays real classical quality in some of the courtyard architecture (see Figs 2.8

& 3.3). The Burghley frontispiece is in the manner one would expect from someone with experience in, or in association with the Royal Works working under Cecil's auspices.

The one anomaly is the departure from French models in the form of the canted bay window on the second floor. A small now sealed compartment behind the clock-tower bay window on its south side appears to have been part of a room in use in the late seventeenth century before it was boarded up.⁶³ But when the clock was installed in the sixteenth century, its weights rising and falling within this space would have precluded it as a roof belvedere or banqueting house with a view to the courtyard, and the window may have been installed to act as a mask for these weights. At Kenilworth, in the south east turret of the keep, the head of a medieval window in its south wall has been cut away to allow the clock-weights of a subsequently installed mechanism to rise and fall within the thickness of the wall (about five feet), below the clock face.⁶⁴ Obviously the bay at Burghley could not have accommodated the weights as it projected beyond the face of the clock above, but it would have left the necessary space to accommodate them, while screening the machinery directly behind from the courtyard side. It is quite possible that there was an earlier clock at Burghley before the 1587 date on the face. The clock-tower over the screens passage of the great hall at Theobalds, completed c.1571 contained an elaborate chiming clock with twelve bells, and in Summerson's view was "one of the most conspicuous features of the house",⁶⁵ while at Kenilworth the clock was famously absorbed into the mythology of the queen's visit when in 1575 it was stopped for the duration of her stay.⁶⁶ These high-status items were often imported from the Continent and one was included in the consignment of goods from Antwerp almost certainly destined for Burghley in 1561.⁶⁷

As circumstantial evidence, the fact that work on the tombs to re-house her ancestors which the queen had specifically commanded at Fotheringhay back in 1566 was finally being attended to in 1573, suggests another royal progress to Northamptonshire was anticipated in the near future. The policy of the Royal Works under Cecil's careful eye

was, as discussed, to confine their activities wherever possible to essential repairs in between visits. The building boom amongst the magnates throughout the county also points to preparation for "that lady saint".⁶⁸ The prospect would undoubtedly have been a spur to Cecil to re-start building to ensure the status of the "principal" house of the queen's principal minister and peer of her realm kept pace with his new estate, and that of the local competition.

Major re-building was definitely underway at Burghley by 1575, almost certainly of a new west range. A previously overlooked view of the west end of the courtyard painted by George Garrard prior to the building of Gandy Deering's corridors and elaborate west end centre-piece (1828-33) gives some impression of the earlier state of the courtyard. One can see for instance how the turrets of the gate-tower formed oriels springing from above the first-floor level.⁶⁹ Described in the 1815 guide-book as having "plain Doric" pillars, Garrard shows the west end indeed to have been rather plainer than the east (Fig A.9).⁷⁰

The only time during progress visits that the west end of the courtyard would have been the focus of view was at departure, when its central gate-tower signalled the staged return to the exterior world. The more sombre impression looking west would have suited the mood of progress farewells, sometimes as complex as those of greeting and in which the house itself might be dramatized to join in the mourning at the sovereign's departure.⁷¹

Organised more to look from than to look at, Garrard shows balustraded terraces over the first-floor bays with their large casement windows. Doors are shown giving access to these areas from the corner stair towers. There is however, no sign of the central belvedere balcony over the entrance-way, as shown on Thorpe's first-floor plan and the single open bays on the ground-floor shown by Thorpe to either side of the entrance arch have been replaced by three-arched glazed bays. Lady Sophia Cecil's somewhat gothicized drawing of 1818 of the West Side Quadrangle has the same features (Fig

A.10). Substantial alterations from what appears on Thorpe's plan had taken place on the ground floor by the time Haynes made his ground plan in 1755 (Plan F.9) and it is reasonable to assume that these alterations were made for the 5th Earl of Exeter towards the end of the seventeenth century. This was when the west range long galleries lost their parade function and were sub-divided into bedrooms and the inward aspects of the first-floor rooms were masked by tapestries, panelling and paintings.⁷² The belvedere would have become redundant. On the ground-floor, a similar policy was probably adopted to that which took place on the south front at this time where the three-bay loggias to either side of the central belvedere shown by Thorpe were converted into six-arched glazed fronts (see Fig A.1).⁷³

If a court audience was imminently anticipated by 1573, the political circumstances also support this as the most likely period for the setting up of the iconographic theme that is indicated by surviving sculptured relief medallions in the courtyard which almost certainly originate from the sixteenth century. These are as follows:-

(1.) On the east clock-tower frontispiece, (Figs 5.20 to 5.23) (in the spandrels to either side of the first-floor and ground-floor arches respectively, busts of:

The Emperor Charles V	The Emperor Suleiman I
(Titled <u>Carolvs Caesar</u>)	(Titled <u>Tyrkcorvm Caesary</u>)
Aeneas	Paris

(2.) Now sited at the west end of the courtyard, (Figs 5.24 to 5.27) (in the spandrels of the arches fronting Gandy Deering's corridor 044) south to north, busts of:

Thersites, Medea, Jason, Poeta, [central entrance arch with sixteenth-century style pages in the spandrels] Nutrix, Andromache, Hector and Helenus.

The positions of the medallions is marked on Fig. 5.28. The busts of the less well-known figures, Thersites and Helenus, Poeta and Nutrix, are contained within incomplete roundels, butted against the return walls of the adjoining fronts and the central archway. All eight of the busts in this second group may originally have been sited in equivalent

positions at the opposite end of the courtyard, where Haynes similarly shows four figure medallions in the main spandrels of the loggia (although none pressed into the half roundels to either side). Placed thus they would have acted as a gloss for the slightly larger medallions featured on the central clock-tower.

Other medallions in the spandrels of the glazed arches inserted by Gandy Deering which now ring the whole courtyard contain relief heads or busts. There are twelve heads of various kings and queens of England from Edward the Confessor to Queen Elizabeth I with titles, and two minus titles are in a similar style. These can reasonably be assumed to date from Gandy Deering's alterations of 1828-33 when an account was submitted to him by "Holmes for carving fourteen heads".⁷⁴ Their style appears to be in imitation of that of the Trojan figures - some of which may themselves be replacement copies of the originals - but they are generally somewhat stiffer and more schematic in style as well as in subject (Fig 5.29)

On Haynes drawing of 1755, the roundels on the north and south pavilions are shown as blank. These presently contain busts of Roman imperial figures and several male and female busts in late medieval or early sixteenth-century style dress. These reliefs are different again in character from the monarch series (Fig 5.30). They have split segmental fillets round the inside panels of the medallions from which it was obviously intended to carve titles.⁷⁵

On the clock-tower the sixteenth-century medallion bust of the Holy Roman Emperor, Charles V (1519-1555), is paired by that presumed to be Suleiman I (1520-1566), the Turkish Emperor who was Charles V's contemporary and rival, widely known in the sixteenth century as "the Great Turk" or "The Magnificent" and ruler over the ancient site of Troy.⁷⁶ The display of these heroic figures follows a trend in picture collecting in England by the mid-sixteenth century. Portraits of the Turkish emperors were remarked upon at Theobalds in 1613⁷⁷ and Foister notes a number of collectors who had

pictures of the "Sultan or Great Turk" in their collections.⁷⁸ Images of Charles V and Suleiman also appear together on a medal struck c. 1530 showing Charles V with an angel on one side and the profile of Suleiman "haunting" him on the other (Fig 5.31).⁷⁹ The Burghley medallions of Charles V and Suleiman I with their surrounding title script are similarly presented in the style of antique medals or coins, of which Cecil had a notable collection, and which enjoyed a major revival as a portrait form in the Renaissance.

The figure busts themselves however, can fairly certainly be identified with a hitherto undiscovered source in the form of prints of portrait busts by the German engraver, Jacob Binck (Figs 5. 20 & 5.21). That of Charles V in particular follows the engraved image very closely, although Binck's image is not in medallion form. A deliberate policy of circulating fairly standardized images of Charles V, featuring his distinctive jutting jaw-line, meant he must have been one of the few instantly recognisable figures of the sixteenth century and there are numerous images on medals and in prints similar to the Burghley bust.⁸⁰ Nevertheless by comparison with numerous of these contemporary images, the singularity of the details of the hat and of the treatment of the hair in Binck's engraving and their similarity to those of the Burghley medallion strongly suggest the one as the particular model for the other. Charles wears the emblem of the of the Golden Fleece, the chivalric order of the Empire which takes its name from the heroic history of Jason who features in one of the smaller medallions. The medallion of Suleiman appears in reverse from the engraving (the more common relationship between works in the two media). Suleiman too, was fond of his own image, but again details, of the collar, the diagonal across the chest, and very similar turban folds, follow Binck's image. In both cases the wording of the roundel titles is comparable to Binck's, and the existence of the two engravings by him as well as the equivalence of detail sustain the probability of the source for the pair of medallions. Binck was born in Cologne c. 1500 and is recorded as working in Antwerp, the major centre for the marketing as well as the production of prints in the sixteenth century. He was there in 1552, having previously worked in Copenhagen and Sweden and he died in 1569. He had settled in Königsberg as

court painter by 1555 when Cecil visited Antwerp⁸¹ but, as discussed earlier, Cecil had every opportunity to obtain such material from Europe through contacts such as Nicholas Houel.⁸² Alternatively the busts themselves like the statues of the Roman Emperors sent from Venice in 1561 and the imported stone galleries⁸³ could have been carved abroad and shipped back to England, as was the case with the image of the queen commissioned in Antwerp for Gresham's Royal Exchange in 1567. However, the political circumstances and resulting difficulties of trading through the Netherlands make this less likely by the early 1570s.⁸⁴ The outer rings of the roundels of Paris and Aeneas are constructed in two parts and are of a coarser stone than the medallions themselves, but in both cases this appears to be oolitic limestone and conformable to locally quarried stone.⁸⁵

Wherever the commission was carried out, the specification must have been very precise. The busts of Charles V and Suleiman I are in higher relief than those of Aeneas and Paris below and were obviously intended to be easily identifiable by an audience in the courtyard as the specific individual emperors rather than simply as abstractions of imperialism. The equality in the manner of presenting these carefully identified figures from the very recent past with that of the Trojans below implies a natural connection between them and, furthermore, that they have the same historical veracity, underlined by the medal format with encircling text. The "Currency of Fame" as this convention for inculcating an authoritative ruler-image has been aptly titled.⁸⁶

No visual source for the Trojan medallions has been established, but they, too, almost certainly derive from images communicated by graphic means. They bear a general similarity to Mannerist works of the early to mid-sixteenth century; that of Medea, for example, to an engraving after Aldegrever's Medea giving the Penates to Jason, and there are several woodcuts or engravings in Binck's surviving catalogued work that are similar in style to the female figures in particular, although there is no record of him reproducing a Trojan cycle (Fig 5.32).

The balcony above the porch of the east frontispiece at Burghley, framed by the first-floor arch with Charles V and Suleiman I in its spandrels, is the architectural focal point of the whole courtyard. As is evident from the bust of Charles II in Haynes view, and still in situ today, it forms an obvious and suitably elevated stage for either the image of the monarch or the monarch in person. Awareness of the advantages of presenting the queen in this manner had already been noted by Thomas Churchyard when she visited Norwich in 1559. Entertainments took place "before a window at whyche the Queene stoode and mighte be playnely seene and openly viewed".⁸⁷

By the time the second phase of building in the east range was completed (probably by the mid 1570s), this balcony across the leads was on the important ceremonial route between the state stairway in the south range, and the chapel at the north end of the east range. The significance that Cecil attached to the presence of the queen's image when she was not to be present in person at the great diplomatic occasions which he hosted, is evident from the fact that he sent for "the Queen's picture" (a term discussed above usually meaning a sculpture in the sixteenth century) to be brought up to London from Burghley as part of the elaborate preparations made for entertaining the French delegation at Cecil House in 1581.⁸⁸ It also establishes that there was at least one image of the queen at Burghley by this date that was important enough to warrant its transfer to London.

In the suggested position "The Most High, Mighty and Magnificent Empresse" as Elizabeth was termed on the dedication page of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*,⁸⁹ would have appeared flanked by images of the two most powerful rulers of the first half of the sixteenth century: her father's greatest contemporaries, equals and rivals, both of whom were the focus of the idea of universal empire deriving from a classical heritage.⁹⁰ They were seen as the twin inheritors of the western and eastern Roman empires, and both proclaimed lineage stemming back to Constantine, and further to the Trojan founders of Rome themselves. By implication the queen, thus placed at Burghley, would have appeared as

the new fulfilment of this imperial and Christian legacy (Fig 5.33) - "Defender of the True Faith" between the heresies of Catholicism and Islam, and the realization of the prophecy made to Aeneas, who features in the spandrel immediately below. According to Virgil, Anchises revealed to Aeneas the golden age of Rome that would come under Augustus "founder of golden centuries once more in Latium, in those same lands where once Saturn reigned; he shall extend our dominion beyond the Garamantians and the Indians"⁹¹ This conceit re-oriented to Elizabeth and conflated with that of the virgin of Virgil's fourth Eclogue, was iterated in A Theatre for Worldlings published in English in 1569; "The Kingdom of Saturn and the Golden world is come again, and the Virgin Astraea is descended from heaven to build her seat in this your most happy country of England."⁹² If busts of Roman emperors wearing their laurel wreaths that presently appear on the north and south pavilions dated from the sixteenth century, like those which featured in the house and garden at Theobalds, then they too would further have reinforced the ambient imperial message.

The image of Paris paired with that of Aeneas below adds another iconographic gloss implying the monarch or her image above as the new choice of the Judgement of Paris, again a familiar trope of numerous paintings and dramas in Elizabeth's reign.⁹³

The inclusion of minor characters in the smaller medallions, loosed from their normal supporting role in narrative scenes, implies a flattering expectation of knowledge of the classical texts on the part of the audience. At the same time the independent figures avoid tying the iconography too closely to any specific aspect of narrative. They do not hammer a didactic message at the audience, but rather invite the intellectual challenge of de-coding an interpretation that is suggested, but not overtly declared. The style is discursive, allowing an inclusive 'insider' participation to the elite group to whom it was addressed. The freedom of response this understated approach appears to offer at the same time avoids the political risk of being committed to a defined meaning. But like the principal figures on the clocktower, once the queen or her image were in place to complete

the picture, the background iconography comes more sharply into focus with the expectation that its dialectic, as with everything within her sphere, inevitably gravitated into the complex mythological atmosphere which surrounded the monarch, and especially so during progress visits. Poeta, the poet not the Muse, is personified as a woman, a pendant to Nutrix, one of the specifically female leadership roles in which the queen was portrayed as "the most loving Mother and Nurse of all her people"⁹⁴, a phrase, echoing Isaiah, "Queenes shalbe [as] nources to their people"⁹⁵ and used by Cecil himself in 1582 to describe the queen.⁹⁶ In the context of the courtyard medallions, the allusion is by means of Aeneas' faithful nurse, of whom Thomas Hoby noted in his diary for 1550:-

"we sailed to Gaieta...This is an auntient towne taking his name of Eneas' nurse so named and buried there, as Virgil makes mention 'Tu quoque littoribus nostris Aeneia nutrix/Aeternam moriens famam Caieta dedisti.'"(Aen. vii 1) ⁹⁷

All the medallions believed to date from the sixteenth century and now in the west end spandrels, can be associated with the Trojan epic. Their significance would have 'naturally' oriented towards the queen as the new inheritor of its heroic virtues and of its forecasts. In Virgil's fourth Eclogue the return of 'Astrea' also prophesies that the coming of a new golden age will be heralded by Jason's "great ship Argo".⁹⁸ This in turn links Jason's adventures to the Trojan saga as a precedent for the great exploration and trading enterprises which the poem promises will be the beginning of "the crowning era foretold in prophecy":-

"A second Argo will carry her crew of chosen heroes...
 ..and great Achilles must sail for Troy again....
 Come soon, dear child of the gods, Jupiter's great viceroy!
 Come soon - the time is near - to begin your life illustrious!
 Look how the round and ponderous globe bows to salute you,
 The lands, the stretching leagues of sea, the unplumbed sky!

Look how the whole creation exults in the age to come"⁹⁹

The passage was a familiar reference at the time. A short quotation from it was part of the scheme painted on the loggia walls in the courtyard, seen by Aubrey at Gorhambury for instance.¹⁰⁰ Other of the medallion figures at Burghley are associated with similar prophesies. According to Ovid, Priam's son, Helenus revealed to Aeneas, the "Goddess-born prince", that he would found a new Troy, which was to be the great city of Rome. "Other leaders will raise it to power, through the long years but one, born of Julius' line, will make it mistress of the world".¹⁰¹ According to the "British History", "Troynavent", "New Troy", was the original name given to London when Aeneas' great-grandson, Brutus, founded the city.¹⁰²

A continuation of the theme of the courtyard extended into the great hall where in 1600 Waldstein noted that it "contained pictures of Medea and Jason, and Hector and Cassandra".¹⁰³ Cassandra, like Andromache, was a prophetess while in one of the most famous passages from Seneca's tragedy, Medea, she too makes a prediction intimating the discovery of the new world, "In later years a new age will come in which Ocean shall relax its hold over the world, and a vast land shall lie open to view."¹⁰⁴ It was a theme that was exciting the whole of Europe in the second half of the sixteenth century. John Dee, an ardent imperialist, was claiming in the 1570s that by the end of King Arthur's reign the Empire of Britain which should rightfully be restored had "byn of twenty Kingdomes" stretching as far as Greenland, claims in which, he recorded, the queen took a serious interest, although he acknowledged Cecil was more circumspect.¹⁰⁵

Representations of this series of figures from the heroic past, can be seen as carrying more political weight than simply as signifiers of a glorious ancestry. They presage an equally heroic and pre-destined future for the inheritor of the line. The theme was regularly rehearsed in dramas "given" to the queen. In 1588 in a masque performed by the pupils of Gray's Inn, for instance, she was lauded as:

"That virtuous Virgo born for Britain's bliss
 That peerless branch of Brute; that sweet remain
 Of Priam's state; that hope of springing Troy.....
 Let her re-duce the golden age again
 Religion, ease and wealth of former world"¹⁰⁶

As Strong has shown, visual images of the queen perpetrated in printed works and propaganda portraits which present her within a symbolic imperial framework become almost a convention of the machinery of official imagery from the mid-1570s to the end of her reign and beyond.¹⁰⁷ Plans to standardise and control the production of all images of the queen which Cecil had been involved in as early as 1563,¹⁰⁸ seem finally to have come to fruition. There could have been no more cogent way for him to organise the presentation of the queen or her image in actuality than within a similar framework designed in the same idiom as these persuasive and pervasive imaginary images.

As touched upon earlier, Cecil had powerfully vested political as well as academic interests in the "British History" that claimed a Trojan ancestry for the Tudor monarchy.¹⁰⁹ The "history" concludes that Cadwallader eventually fled to Rome where he died, but that the royal line was not extinguished in Wales, and merely lay dormant until, as was prophesied, a Welsh monarch should once more come to the throne and restore the former glory of the realm.¹¹⁰

Nor did these claims attach only to the Welsh Tudor monarchy, whose genealogists traced the origins of the line back to Cadwallader. As Girouard has pointed out, the Trojan figures at Burghley had personal significance for Cecil.¹¹¹ His own genealogy had been plotted back to Welsh royal blood, amongst others, by the Welsh Herald, David Powel, who declared that "these pedigrees and descents I gathered faithfully out of sundrie ancient records and evidences Whereof the most part are confirmed with seales authenticke

thereunto appendant manifestly".¹¹² The precision of claims such as these was in contention from the beginning,¹¹³ but Cecil was by no means alone in this quest for glorious ancestors. Erasmus enumerated the folly as one of the most common weaknesses of self-love of "those who are no better than the humblest worker but take extraordinary pride in an empty form of nobility, one tracing his family back to Aeneas, another to Brutus, a third to Arcturus. They display the statues and portraits of their ancestors everywhere."¹¹⁴ Without doubt, Cecil suffered acutely from this weakness of the socially insecure. But his purpose was part of his politically motivated and overriding ambition to establish his dynasty, the step back in time vital to the great leap forward, rather than simply as personal vanity for "an empty form of nobility" as an end in itself. The hierarchies of time and blood are, after all, the most exclusive of all social structures. Cecil was one of only two nobles created by Elizabeth who did not already have obvious blood ties with the queen. She was, moreover, extremely reluctant to add to an average total of only some sixty peers at any one time during her reign. Only thirteen new peers were created throughout the whole reign, and only one, William Cecil, who was exclusively a "scribe" and not a "swordsmen".¹¹⁵

As one might expect, Cecil's manuscript collection reflected a serious interest in the "evidences" that could be put forward to support the idea of these politically convenient claims, in particular Geoffrey of Monmouth's chronicles, two copies of which were listed amongst the manuscripts in the sale catalogue of 1687¹¹⁶ and there are also contemporary references confirming Cecil's ownership of this work in the sixteenth century.¹¹⁷ Also listed in 1687 are Dares Phrygius de Bello Trojano, the Aeneid, the Chronicon de Bruto et de gestis Angulorum, a Book of Chronicles, clyped Brute "being a history of the Kings of England from Brute to K. Henry V", three copies of Higden's Polychronicon, and Mathew Paris' Historia Angliae.¹¹⁸ But there is also, for instance, a manuscript by John Major, the sixteenth-century historian who was sceptical about the validity of the story and certainly, like Camden, of the embroidered and fantastic glosses that were part of the well-massaged folk-memory of the nation. "British History" lying in the margins between fact

and fiction and far more desirable than that which bald facts rendered was, however, too potent a propaganda tool for the monarchy and for his personal strategy not to be exploited by Cecil.

At Burghley, moreover, he could conveniently insinuate the personal pretensions of his own lineage without putting himself in the ridiculous light described by Erasmus, by framing them within a schema that was ostensibly addressed to the monarch. This oblique device was typical of the conventional idioms of communication within the Elizabethan court culture. The "dim veil, with which from comune vew/Their fairer parts are hid", as Spenser described his "ydle rimes" wherein the "deeper sense be inly wayd", in his dedicatory sonnet addressed to Cecil.¹¹⁹ At Burghley the theme and the device, message and medium, were a perfect iconographic choice for the house that was both a court-in-waiting for the sovereign and the flagship of his own dynasty. Numbers of other successful Elizabethan families including the Vaughans the Pembrokes and the Hobys, who would have been amongst the anticipated audience for Burghley, shared this fashionable Welsh blood and could also have identified with the glamorous associations of national pride that formed the subject of a huge body of romance literature, drama and poetry addressed to the queen. The theme had not lost its potency by the first decades of the following century when Michael Drayton lauded the Celtic heritage over that of the Anglo Saxon in his patriotic poem, Poly-Olbion(1612-22)

"Think how much better 'tis for thee, and those of thine
from Gods and heroes old to draw your famous line,
than from the Scythian poor; whence they themselves derive,
Whose multitude did first you to the mountains drive"¹²⁰

The heroic Trojan heritage was the common iconographic currency used by the crowned heads of Europe who had similar interest of their own.¹²¹ The widespread resurgence of interest in the concept, if not the reality, of world rulership and global empire

that centred around Charles V's tenure as Holy Roman Emperor (1519-1556) - a position that Henry VIII himself had coveted - was carefully fostered through propaganda events and the management of imperial imagery. The scheme for his entry into Antwerp has already been mentioned as a possible source for architectural features at Burghley.¹²²

The iconographic programme chosen for Henry's new hunting lodge at Nonsuch, begun in 1538, had a robustly imperial content. In hindsight, however, Wolsey's choice of a set of imperial Roman medallion busts for his palace at Hampton Court can be seen as the less politically astute action of an 'alter rex' than Cecil's later theme at Burghley. Cecil was always careful, even when writing to old friends such as Sir Henry Sidney, to promote the notion that his building activities were undertaken, at his own expense, entirely as tributes to the queen.¹²³ They were built to "have her Majesty see my good will in my service",¹²⁴ for "Her for whom we both [he and Hatton] meant to exceed our purses".¹²⁵ Theobalds was "increased by occasion of her Majesty's often coming, whom to please I never would omit to strain myself to more charges than building is".¹²⁶ It is only in his private diary that he describes his real view of Theobalds. With its "curious buildings, delightful walks and pleasant conceites inside and out, and other things very glorious and elegant to be seene" altogether "I leave it, as indeed it is, a Princely Seate."¹²⁷

The imperial idea pertaining to Elizabeth was given clear expression as early as 1563 in the first edition of Foxe's Acts and Monuments where Foxe compares Elizabeth to Constantine "the greate and mightie Emperour, the sonne of Helene an Englyshe woman of this your realme and countrie".¹²⁸ Anglo has recently questioned the impact, claimed by many scholars (including formerly, himself), of this and similar imagery on the population at large and therefore the extent to which it can be interpreted as self-conscious propaganda by or for the crown.¹²⁹ At Burghley however, Cecil's anticipated court audience constituted the niche group within which power and influence resided, and this corporate body towards whom his signals were directed was highly tuned to receive and register them.

Despite the early stirring of imperialism, the 1570s is the most likely period for the introduction of the theme at Burghley when imperial imagery associated with the queen was becoming widespread. Heroic iconography that could be associated with "British History" was the ideal political vehicle for promoting the concept of the continuity of religious, as well as political stability, attendant upon the person of the queen. These were conjoined in the imperial claim and could be implied without the danger of venturing into overt religious imagery. The concept of this stability had been severely shaken by the turmoil of the Northern rising of 1569, and the exposure of the subsequent Ridolfi plot of 1571 to depose Queen Elizabeth in favour of the Catholic Mary Queen of Scots, which incriminated amongst others the premier noble of Elizabeth's realm, the Duke of Norfolk. The St Bartholomew's Day Massacre in August 1572 sent further shock-waves through England as well as France, intimating the potential instability of the political and religious situation. In the 1569 rebellion, it was Cecil's position even more than the queen's that had been the initial target. Hostility to Cecil's ever increasing power was to be a constant, particularly in Catholic circles from now on. In January 1571/2 one of his informants in Northamptonshire reported that he had heard a "gentleman esquire" declaring that Cecil had "destroyed and spoiled three noble houses viz. the Duke of Norfolk's and the Earls that fled out of the North. And that now he had erected his pile at Burghley (he demanded) who should destroy that?"¹³⁰ The apparent self-assurance and permanence of place that Burghley House still emanates so successfully, were in reality by no means a direct reflection of an unchallenged and unchallengable Cecilian power base.

Cecil's unpublished pamphlet, England Triumphant written in response to the queen's excommunication in 1570 not only traced the monarchy's authority back to Brutus of Troy as chronicled by Geoffrey of Monmouth, it took in another aspect of the "British History", the legend of Joseph of Arimathea bringing the Holy Grail and true religion to England.¹³¹ It took up the theme of Bishop Jewel's Defence of the Apology of the Church of England, published in 1567, in asserting the imperial rights derived from the

early Christian emperors, and Constantine in particular, which the papacy had usurped. The imperial party in England, as that of Charles V on the Continent had done,¹³² thus cast the monarch in the role not of conquering military ruler, but of the peaceful restorer of ancient rights, "We flatter not our prince with any new-imagined extraordinary power" as Jewel declaimed.¹³³ In 1573 Sir John Price's *Historiae Britannica Defensio* was published. It too argued the case for the British History against the denial of its substance as historical fact made by Polydore Vergil earlier in the century. French describes Price's book, which was dedicated to Cecil, as "the major scholarly affirmation of the pro-Brutus-Arthur faction".¹³⁴

In France meanwhile, the great propaganda event of 1571 was the entry into Paris, celebrating the marriage between two imperial houses with an iconographic programme tracing their histories back to Trojan origins. Francus, the supposed son of Hector (who features at Burghley), fulfilled the role of Brutus in England.¹³⁵ The marriage question in England continued to be a highly charged political issue. Negotiations for a union between Elizabeth of England and Catherine de Medici's younger son, Henry, Duke of Anjou, which Cecil was engaged in promoting had opened in 1570 and continued through 1571 and 1572.¹³⁶ In the Summer of 1572 a major diplomatic exchange took place when a delegation led once again by Francis, now Duke of Montmorency, came to England to ratify the treaty of Blois. The suitor was now Henry's younger brother, the Duke of Alençon. The informal agenda was to promote the marriage and Cecil put on lavish entertainment for the embassy.¹³⁷ The 1572 delegation did not travel far from London and was terminated by the horrendous events of St Bartholomew's Day, but a hunting party to Northamptonshire would not have been an unlikely event in the programme of entertainments laid on for these often prolonged diplomatic visits. Proclaiming the Tudor monarchy's equal right to the same antique lineage as the Valois and the Habsburgs through similar iconography as was current in France would have given a sharp political edge to the imagery at Burghley in the 1570s, with a further sweetly nationalist twist added by the presence of Paris in the iconography. The punishment for

Paris's first Judgement was prophesied to lead ultimately to the termination of Priam's line from whom Francus was descended. The queen as the new choice was of the line of Aeneas, prophesied to be the father of dynasties for a thousand generations.

The marriage theme which was never far from the political agenda was firmly on that of court entertainments in the 1570s. On progress it was the subject of an entertainment in the form of a debate, a favourite convention in humanist circles, planned for the Kenilworth visit in July 1575, in which the protagonists from the classical world were to have been Juno and Diana. In the event it was not performed although Leicester still managed to press his own suit on the queen in the rather less elevated guise of a holly bush. The subject was however, raised again in another masque performed at Woodstock that September.¹³⁸

The iconography at Burghley may have constituted a Pantheon associating monarch and minister with the "Gods and Heroes" as was to be described by Michael Drayton.¹³⁹ Girouard has noted what appear to be low relief panels of life-size figures of Mercury, Pallas Athena, and an unidentified female goddess, shown on Haynes' view of the courtyard (Figs 5.34, A.6e).¹⁴⁰ If these date from the sixteenth century, the scheme broadly accords with Vitruvius' description of decorative themes in 'good' taste:-

"For atriums and peristyles, the ancients required realistic pictures of real things...in some places there are also pictures designed in the grand style, with figures of the gods or detailed mythological episodes or the battles of Troy..."¹⁴¹

The exterior decoration at Theobalds described in the Parliamentary survey of 1650 included "Verrie manie faire curious paintinges and gildinges of pictures, whereof two are called the pictures of Peace and Warre".¹⁴² These were most probably similar mythological personifications, and possibly part of a series as the wording suggests. They were situated

under the first-floor arch of the porch frontispiece leading below to the great hall, and, here again, the word "picture" at this date suggests these were sculptures or reliefs of some sort. The iconography of the inner-court at Nonsuch, one of the queen's favourite palaces, included at least twelve male and sixteen female life-sized mythological figures, modelled in stucco.¹⁴³ Although there were also narrative scenes at Nonsuch, the general shift in taste throughout Europe by the second quarter of the sixteenth century was towards these individual figures, previously confined to the decorative margins of major work as they had been at Fontainebleau, for instance.¹⁴⁴ The cycle of the Seasons in low relief panels by, or closely following Goujon, in the courtyard of the Hotel Carnavalet in Paris, is one of the most notable examples of these detached images, which like those in Haynes' view have no architectural framework (Fig 5.35) Dating from the 1550s or 1560s, these are identified by Thomson as the earliest example of prominent allegorical reliefs in a private house in France.¹⁴⁵ A series of classical divinities in individual niches by Rosso were widely disseminated through engravings made by Caraglio, du Cerceau, Thirty, and in 1530, by Jacob Binck who printed a set of twenty which included figures of Pallas and Mercury (Fig 5.36).¹⁴⁶

The figures as shown on Haynes' drawing differ markedly from these engraved images, but as Turquet points out, the series (a possible source or influence at Nonsuch) "provided an important example of the type of illustration of individual divinities which by their simple iconography were easily adaptable for other artists and programmes".¹⁴⁷ Haynes' figures of Mercury and Pallas indeed display all the conventional props, perhaps themselves used to help clarify the identities which the surveyor's strictly limited ability (when it came to figures) was too tentative to convey by more subtle means. Another figure of Mercury also by Binck corresponds more closely to that shown by Haynes (Fig.5.36c).

If, as is certainly possible, the figures shown by Haynes do date from Cecil's time they must have been re-sited.¹⁴⁸ According to Thorpe there would have been no wall space in any of the positions indicated by Haynes (Plan F1). The only logical position for which

Thorpe shows adequate wall space for them within the courtyard would be under the east end loggia arcade from where they would have been relocated to former window and door recesses when these were blocked.¹⁴⁹ Daniel Mytens' painting of the 2nd Earl of Arundel (c. 1618) shows his collection of classical sculptures displayed in just such a position in what is probably an idealized portrayal of his London gallery (Fig 5.37).¹⁵⁰ Reliefs in the west facing loggia at Burghley, like those in Arundel's gallery would have been "greatly enhanced by the play of light through the loggia which throws rhythmic patterns on the floor" as Henderson observes.¹⁵¹

The great fountain built for the queen at Greenwich as well as the Venus and Cupid fountain at Theobalds very possibly had nude or semi-nude figures,¹⁵² but there are few surviving examples of any size in England dating from this period. The stone table on the first floor of Sharrington's tower at Lacock, probably the work of John Chapman, is a good example of the thin red line of high quality figural sculpture in England evident in the mid-sixteenth century. It includes reasonably convincing torsos of satyrs, their musculature shown under the pressure of supporting the table. Certain details of this table display similarities to those of the chimneypiece in the great hall at Burghley (Figs 5.38, 5.39). The form of this chimneypiece is an amalgam of designs taken from Serlio but, as Girouard has noted, it also has similarities with the tombs in Bedford and Buckinghamshire identified as a related group by Whinney and others,¹⁵³ and described by Girouard as showing "possible French influence including that of Goujon."¹⁵⁴ The cadaver on the tomb of Anthony Cave and his wife, erected at Chicheley in Buckinghamshire in 1576, is a rare surviving example in England at this time of competent treatment of the naked body, in the manner of Germain Pilon on the tomb of Henry II and his queen at St Denis (1563-70). The tomb also has marked similarities to that of Louis de Brézé, Seneschal of Normandy and husband of Diane of Poitiers in Rouen cathedral, possibly by Goujon (Figs 5.40 - 5.42).¹⁵⁵ The naturalism of the Chicheley body shows an understanding of the human form which is in strong contrast to the schematic little mannequins representing husband and wife and their children, and suggests that they were governed by different conventions of decorum, as one sees distinguishing the

members of the patron's family from the figures that are part of the religious narrative in Ghirlandaio's fresco cycle for Giovanni Tornabuoni in Santa Maria Novella (1485-90), for example and that this is not necessarily a result of limited ability.

Like Cecil's brother-in-law, Roger Cave, who married his sister in 1562, Anthony Cave was of the same family who came from Stanford in Northamptonshire. The patron of the two Mordaunt tombs at Turvey in Bedfordshire which are of this group meanwhile, was almost certainly Lewis 3rd Earl Mordaunt.¹⁵⁶ As mentioned above, he moved to Drayton c.1571, the date of the 2nd Earl Mordaunt's tomb. There is one surviving gateway in the garden at Drayton, which has the same distinctive palmettes in the triglyphs as feature on the tombs.¹⁵⁷ Not only is there thus a connection of patronage to Northamptonshire via Mordaunt, as with the Cecils, there were also family ties between the Mordaunts and Caves, and Anthony Cave also owned land at Drayton.¹⁵⁸

Cecil's full achievement carved in the roundel centre-piece of the overmantel of the great hall chimneypiece at Burghley, and also that sited over the entrance arch on the west front, have similarities with 2nd Earl Mordaunt's tomb and details of the inscription panel above the sarcophagus of Anthony Cave's tomb at Chicheley (Fig 5.43). The most striking details common to all the tombs and almost a leitmotif at Burghley is the use of the square and cipher pattern, in particular as soffit decoration, but also used in different scales, to form girdles for the caryatids of 1st Earl Mordaunt's tomb or decorative straps round the sarcophagus of Alexander Denton's tomb at Hillesden in Buckinghamshire. Like the tombs the almost animal vigour of the forms of the chimneypiece is held in dynamic tension by the underlying discipline and restraint of architectonic design (Figs 5.44 - 5.46). This shows an ability and understanding well beyond that of a mere pattern-copier, and the Burghley chimneypiece can be very reasonably compared with approximately contemporary French examples, like two now at Ecoen (Fig 5.47). The roundel over the chimneypiece is carved in very fine oolite, reminiscent of stone used in the tombs at Fotheringhay, possibly Barnack oolite of a much finer texture than one normally associates

with stone from quarries there, but of which there was a limited supply usually reserved for effigies.¹⁵⁹ The decorative frame on the Fotheringhay tomb shown in Fig 5.16 in turn shows similarities with details of the Cave tomb as well as the Burghley chimneypiece.

Drury has recently demonstrated that the former attribution of the group of tombs to Thomas Kirby, and subsequent association with Smith's Hill Hall, was based on a misunderstanding and cannot be substantiated.¹⁶⁰ Nevertheless there was obviously a sculptor/mason or group of sculptor/masons of considerable ability who had a clear knowledge and understanding of recent French architectural and sculptural form working in this area of the Midlands in the 1570s, and who would have been quite competent to execute a cycle of full scale figures at Burghley. If the Burghley panels were by the same hand or hands as the tombs then one can imagine they would have been a very glossy feature of the 'stage' end of the courtyard, placed in an equivalent manner to the sculptures one can see in Palladio's Teatro Olimpico, for example (Fig 5.48).

Haynes shows three of the protagonists associated with the Judgement of Paris, Mercury and Pallas and Paris himself. The third panel at the east end of the south wall cannot be identified, but it appears to be female and adopting a traditionally feminine pose. Venus and Juno, both of whom were amongst the engravings after Rosso made by Binck, would complete the set. At Theobalds Venus was the subject of the great fountain in the centre of the Conduit Court where the accommodation for the queen was sited.¹⁶¹ There was also a "Mount of Venus" in the garden, and if she similarly featured at Burghley then the mother of the "goddess-born" Aeneas, one in the same goddess as the queen was figured as replacing in the new Judgement incarnation, would have been present to add further resonance to the iconography.¹⁶²

Already by 1564 when the queen visited Cambridge, Cecil was displaying a shrewd understanding of the management of the sort of propaganda spectacle for which the courtyard architecture and iconography at Burghley would have made a splendid

backdrop.¹⁶³ For the performance of Plautus' *Aulularia* a throne for the queen was built on the stage itself.¹⁶⁴ The queen's presence dominated the whole environment wherever she might be and the double drama of the play and of the queen were thus ingeniously combined as a single interactive focus.

"The Inner Court is beautiful Scenery" Walpole declared of Burghley which he visited in 1763.¹⁶⁵ It is an apt description of an undoubtedly theatrical space. A space which Cecil must have anticipated, from the very beginning of his building campaigns, would act effectively as a theatre of power under the guise of a pleasure dome, for entertainments laid on for the corporate body of the queen and the court. From Haynes' view of the east end of the courtyard, which must have been much as Walpole saw it eight years later, and in most respects the view that would have confronted the visitor on entry to the courtyard by 1585, one can infer how well the area would have catered for such engagements. The three elevations visible in the view are all symmetrical about their central climactic features, all of which, like the ceremonial entrance itself, derive from the triumphal arch and provide ideal frames within which to display and celebrate the human presence. There are no giant orders or temple fronts. The scale is human and designed to enhance rather than dominate that human presence, and in the case of the first-floor archways, to be completed by it. The loggias, balconies, inward-looking casement windows, balustraded terraces and roofscape that encircle the courtyard would have provided a variety of sociable but discreet viewing spaces allowing for different "degrees" of person. These features serve to diminish what is, within a courtyard, the already reduced barrier between interior and exterior space.

Vitruvius, describing the scenes appropriate for tragic, comic and satiric Roman drama outlines how "Tragic scenes are delineated with columns, pediments, statues, and other objects suited to kings; comic scenes exhibit private dwellings, with balconies and views representing rows of windows".¹⁶⁶ Serlio transferred the essence of Vitruvius' specification into the text of the second book of his treatise on perspective, published in

1545. Of tragedies he described how they "happen always in the houses of Great Lords, Dukes, Princes and Kings, therefore ...no building will be shown that does not have something of the noble".¹⁶⁷ However, as has been pointed out elsewhere, Serlio's illustrations of deep perspective scenes are based on a misinterpretation of Vitruvius who was referring to scenes depicted on the panels of revolving prisms at the sides of the stage.¹⁶⁸ In fact, the "scaena" itself as described by Vitruvius was a flat facade. "In the centre are double doors decorated like those of a royal palace. At the right and left are the doors of the guest chambers. Beyond [i.e. to either side] are spaces provided for decoration".¹⁶⁹ In the Teatro Olimpico at Vicenza, Palladio follows Vitruvius rather than Serlio, and as is clear from the fresco of the opening performance of 1585, the emphasis was on creating a spatially and architecturally unified area in which the boundaries between actors and audience were minimized (Figs 5.48, 5.49a).¹⁷⁰

Exploring the correspondence between Palladio's theatrical space and Veronese's construction of pictorial space, Rosand observes how Veronese's use of this space "lent itself particularly to ceremonial scenes of procession and reception".¹⁷¹ Such rituals were the very essence of Elizabethan progress events. If one imagines the courtyard at Burghley animated by the Elizabethan court, as it was intended to be, then it bears comparison with the atmosphere of the environment evoked in Veronese's construct of the pageant of The Family of Darius before Alexander (Fig 5.49b). The classical architecture provides an ideally ambivalent setting. Is this a courtly enactment of a historic moment, the meaning of which has relevance to the contemporary sixteenth-century circumstances of patrician patrons, or is it an evocation, within the cultural context in which Veronese worked, of the "real" historic event of 333 B.C.?

In England this kind of blurring of the parameter between fact and fiction was the very stuff upon which the dramatic effect of tailor-made masques and plays designed to be performed to the queen relied. The play, as Butler observes was always a play within a play. It was "the nature of the sovereign's presence to turn any court performance into a

dialogue".¹⁷² The background "scenery" was an important part of this interplay between differing levels of reality. In works such as George Peele's The Arraignement of Paris (c.1581-4) the traditional narrative is subverted so the queen is absorbed into the drama and becomes its nucleus. Following Paris's Judgement and his departure to Troy "Diana is nominated to re-adjudicate the choice and she reaches out beyond the fiction to offer the apple to Elizabeth. Elizabeth's new Troy reverses the tragic doom of the old because her chastity embodies that national inviolability against which it has been Paris' crime to transgress".¹⁷³ As Butler points out, the play is similar to dramas put on during royal progresses. Indeed it was Peele, who dedicated his long verse poem on the Trojan histories to Cecil, who may have been the author of the entertainment for the queen's visit to Theobalds in 1591.¹⁷⁴

In the painting of Queen Elizabeth and the Three Goddesses, the meaning of the narrative has been similarly re-oriented.¹⁷⁵ Here, however, the mere presence of the queen, who wears the imperial crown, has made the re-adjudication superfluous. As in the Veronese, and another fresco from the Teatro Olimpico, the scene is shown as a tableau vivant running across the picture plane, the narrative underlined by theatrically rhetorical gestures (Fig 5.50). Juno beckons the queen out into the landscape inhabited by the other goddesses where her carriage, drawn by the peacocks, waits in the distance. At the same time she stands within the same architectural space as Elizabeth and it is recognisably Windsor Castle that stands in the landscape behind her. At Burghley the opportunity for the queen or her image to be placed in its imperial context above the "stage" could similarly have hovered dramatically on the brink between fictive drama and the real drama of her presence. The courtyard architecture at Theobalds, so similar to Burghley at its focal end, was used in exactly this manner as a two-tier stage for a performance to James I and the King of Denmark in 1606 where, "The Kings being entered the Inner Court above over the porch sat three hours upon clouds as at the ports of Heaven".¹⁷⁶

As one can see if one compares Palladio's theatre with the architecture of the courtyard at Burghley, like many Italian Renaissance villas and palaces which were similarly designed to function on occasions as settings for dramatic performances, there was no need for an illusory "scaena".¹⁷⁷ The "stage" with its central focus of the frontispiece porch, loggia screen and aristocratic architecture was in reality the "beautiful scenery" of the courtyard itself.

But this scenery was not mere flats. The fronts which formed this theatre in the round which was the centre of the house geographically, socially and architecturally were composed by the surrounding body of the house as it was developed and transformed in the second phase of Cecil's building campaign. Begun shortly after Cecil chose to take his title from the Northamptonshire house, like its patron it was to be transformed into the aristocracy of English country houses.

-
- 1 Edmund Spenser The Faerie Queene Bk. 2 cant. xii 43, Smith and de Selincourt Eds 1991, 135
 - 2 Waldstein f.136 Ed. Groos 1981, 83
 - 3 Edmund Spenser The Faerie Queene Bk. 2 cant xii 48-9 Eds. Smith and de Selincourt 1991, 135-6
 - 4 Tytler 1839 ii, 111
 - 5 B.R. Smith 1977, 110
 - 6 North Eds. Covin & Newman 1981, 145
 - 7 SP Ireland 63/18/19
 - 8 Alberti Ed. Leoni 17, 105
 - 9 Alberti Ed. Leoni 17, 85
 - 10 Gandy Deering's drawings for Burghley are held at the house in a large wooden storage box marked "Commence June 1828 Finished 1833 Drawings of the late improvements of Burghley House"
 - 11
 - 12 As Girouard describes, the "whole character of the courtyard is French" (Girouard 1992, Pt II, 59)
 - 13 Harrison, Ed. Edelen 1968, 227
 - 14 Whitney 1586, 1
 - 15 Schama 1995, 283-284
 - 16 See below in this chapter
 - 17 Summerson 1995, 227. The anecdote related by Fuller describing how Thomas Gresham re-built a wall across his courtyard at Osterley Park in the middle of the night, following the queen's criticism of its huge size is probably apocryphal, or at least an exaggeration, but it suggests that she was not impressed by vast empty spaces, and preferred more intimate areas. (Fuller 1952 Vol 2, 35)
 - 18 Girouard has suggested that on the grounds of its consistent French character, all the surviving architecture of the courtyard dates from the second phase of Cecil's building (Girouard 1992, Pt II, 60)
 - 19 As already mentioned, this was almost opposite Cecil's London house.
 - 20 I am indebted to Dr Krista De Jonge of Leuven University for this reference given in correspondence in February 1995
 - 21 See below, Chapter 6 for full discussion of this proposal
 - 22 There is no definite documentary evidence to confirm this but Bullant is recorded as working at Ecouen at this date and the attribution is fairly certain (See Blunt 1973, 135)
 - 23 Pevsner 1973, 139
 - 24 Thomson 1994, 221
 - 25 Du Cerceau 1576/79
 - 26 Simpson 1977, 8
 - 27 SP Foreign Elizabeth I, 1558-1559 No 729
 - 28 SP Foreign Elizabeth I, 1558-1559 No 732
 - 29 SP Foreign Elizabeth I, 1558-1559 No 740. This was a significant gesture as one of the conditions of the treaty was that the French queen should not use the arms of England (Read 1955, 176)
 - 30 Simpson 1977, 8-9; Cal SP Foreign 1563 letter 1325 pt 2 19th October; letter 1394 pt 2 12th November
 - 31 R. Cooper 1990, 10
 - 32 Simpson 1977, 9
 - 33 Simpson 1977, 12

-
- 34 Burgon 1839, Vol 2, 346
 35 Cal SP Dom Addenda 13/35
 36 Summerson 1959, 107 quoting Hatfield MSS Vol 143/101
 37 One of the former monastic houses where his mother now lived
 38 Nichols 1788-1821, Vol i, 199 refers to "White Friars", the former Carmelite Friary that also belonged to Cecil, but as is clear from RCHME Stamford 1977, 33, there has been persistent confusion between "White" and "Grey" Friars, and the property with the gateway (still in existence) illustrated in Nichols is the "Greyfriars" where Cecil's mother lived. NRS pamphlet No 1592 (1886-87) quotes Rev C. Nevison's History of Stamford where he makes the same error as Nichols, stating that the queen was "entertained by Lord Treasurer Burghley at Stamford in 1565 when she dined in the house in the White Friars, in the following year she was again his guest at the house of the Grey Friars" and where his mother had lived since 1556 or thereabouts, (it was to here again that the queen's lodgings were diverted from Burghley in 1566. (BL Lansdowne MSS Vol 3 f. 118 Kemp to Cecil 12 December 1556, and PRO 31/3/26 Baschet transcripts, J de Vulcob à Bochetel, 132)
- 39 King's Works IV, 67
 40 King's Works III, 249
 41 SP Ireland 63/18/19, (also mentioned above)
 42 SP Ireland 63/18/19
 43 A long letter from Thomas Cecil to his father in 1569 for instance discusses many details of estate affairs, but there is no mention of building works (SP Dom 12/49/81
 44 Hatfield MSS C/202/108
 45 Referred to thus by Cecil in his letter to Walsingham, mentioned above (SP Dom 12/193/28) and similarly in another letter to him in the following year SP 12/20/40, 22nd May 1587
 46 Summerson 1959, 110-111
 47 See for example among the plans in the Hatfield MSS "a platt for to have reformed ye old house" Hatfield MSS Vol 143/29 & 30, the retention of the original court dimensions at both houses cited above, and the general pattern of his building work at Theobalds as outlined by Summerson (Summerson 1959, 107-126)
- 48 Hatfield MSS C/202/108, 26th May 1573 Kemp to Cecil
 49 Read 1956, 344; Summerson 1959, 111
 50 Barnett 1969, 93 quoting Cecil Papers, v. 140, p.20
 51 Pevsner & Cherry 1975, 178; (NB, part of the text for Deene Park for the 1975 edition has been revised and expanded by Bruce Bailey
 52 Pevsner 1975, 279
 53 Pevsner 1975, 139
 54 Unpublished research by RCHME, NBR File 61863, 3
 55 Nicholas, 1847 224, printed in T. Wright 1838 Vol 2, 98
 56 HMC Salisbury Series 9 Vol 2 no 586, 200, 11th September 1578, for example. This letter is discussed in more detail in chapter 7. Thomas came and went of course, but Burghley was his principal family home and where, as he wrote to his father in 1572, his third son was born on 29th February and the Godfathers were to be the Earl of Rutland and the Bishop of Peterborough. (Cal SP Addenda 85/56)
- 57 Girouard 1959, 205
 58 A number of other contracts went to Thomas Hayward "perhaps (but not necessarily) being the same as Haward my Lo. Treasurer Masson" (King's Works III, 251.)
 59 King's Works III, 251

-
- 60 Hatfield MSS 143/50
- 61 The honour of having supporters for a crest as well as for the shield is extremely unusual if not unique outside families of royal blood
- 62 Girouard 1979, 1287
- 63 See Leatham 1992, 60. The roof-space behind 247 subsequently became attached to the main body of the second floor by the building of 246 immediately behind it,. There is a rainwater head on the exterior north wall of this room dated 1640 and it seems probable that the new building dates from the time of this installation.
- 64 Information supplied by Richard Morris
- 65 Summerson 1959, 111 & 118
- 66 Laneham Ed. Furnivall 1907, 76
- 67 SP Dom 12/20/43. Antwerp was a well-known centre of the clockmaking trade
- 68 Hatton referring to the queen in 1580, quoted by Girouard 1979,1289
- 69 The bases of these octagonal towers still exist and confirm what Garrard shows. They are now suppressed behind the plasterwork of the first-floor corridors (Information from Alan Wilson)
- 70 Drakard 1815, 15
- 71 In 1602 at Harefield "Place" appeared in "partie-colored roobe, like the brick house" and at the farewell ceremony "attyred in black mourning aparell" (Chambers 1961 Vol 4, 67). A similar conceit was enacted in a masque by Ben Jonson when Theobalds was handed over to King James and his Queen in 1607
- 72 This is inferred from the tapestries listed in the 1688 Inventory and the number of curtains per room (Exeter MSS E51/18) also from the existing disposition of the furnishings and fittings. The upper windows in the south range and all the windows in the "Heaven Room" (115) were blocked by Verrio's paintings
- 73 Work undertaken by John Thompson 1682-87 (Till 1975,984)
- 74 This information was supplied by Dr Till, from the original paper found in the estate office.
- 75 There is also what appears to be an almost identical relief to that of "Nutrix" but minus the title, in the outer spandrel of the north face of the east end courtyard porch at first floor level, which must presumably be a copy made for this less significant position; but like the north and south pavilion busts, there is no indication of whether this was originally effected in the sixteenth century or later, possibly when the cycle of kings and queens were commissioned.
- 76 Koenigsberger Ed. et al 1989, 244
- 77 Rye 1865, 163
- 78 "Sir Ralph Waren in 1554, John West in 1569 and Thomas Key in 1572" for instance, (Foister 1981, 278)
- 79 Hale 1993, 39
- 80 de Biève 1992, 288. As Biève notes, Charles V's image which appeared on the standardized coinage in circulation throughout his territories was used, following the example of the Romans, as a means of stamping his identity as ruler throughout his dominion. The gateway of the Imperial Mint in the Netherlands at Dortrecht built circa 1555 also underlined its function by having "coin-like roundels" in the spandrels of its entrance arch.
- 81 Hollstein [1954] Vol 4,12; Aumuller, 1893, 1-5
- 82 Houel's list as detailed in Chapter 1 included German masters amongst "the portraits of the most excellent workmen in the world" and "Greek and Roman history" amongst the subjects covered by his collection (SP Dom Addenda 1571, 20/89)
- 83 SP Dom 12/19/1 discussed above

- 84 Burgon Vol 2, 119. Most of the figures, however, seem to have been made in England, and it is more likely that this was so at Burghley. By the end of 1560s, after the seizing of the Spanish bullion by the English in 1569, the political situation meant trade through Antwerp was almost impossible.
- 85 I am grateful to Diana Sutherland, Alan Dawn and Bruce Bailey for examining the stonework in the courtyard. It was not however possible to have such good access to the medallions as was possible for the hall chimneypiece, and those on the first floor were not accessible at all.
- 86 Title of a recent exhibition at the National Gallery of Scotland (Sept 1994-Jan 1995 'The Currency of Fame: Portrait Medals of the Renaissance')
- 87 Bergeron 1971, 40, quoting Thos Churchyard a Discourse of the Queenes majesties Entertainments in Suffolk and Norfolk (London, 1558) sig.C2 . In 1573 Archbishop Parker wrote to Cecil worrying about the queen's lodgings in Canterbury where the house was "of an evill ayer , hanging upon the churche and having no prospect to loke on the people (Chambers 1961, Vol 1, 110)
- 88 Read 1960, 258
- 89 Spenser Ed. Smith & de Selincourt 1991, facing page 3
- 90 Koenigsberger 1989, 242 & 235-241
- 91 Virgil Aeneid vi 791-5, Trans. Jackson Knight 1974, 171.
- 92 Quoted in Yates 1985, 113
- 93 See below for examples cited in this chapter
- 94 McClure & Hedlam Wells 1990, 42, quoting Anthony Munday A Watch-woord to Englande (London 1584) Sig. A iii
- 95 McClure & Hedlam Wells 1990, 42, quoting Isaiah 49.23
- 96 "...whereby her poor people may long enjoy her as a mother and a nurse of general peace" (Ellis 1843, No 44)
- 97 Hoby Ed. Powell 1902, 64, 27
- 98 Quoted in Rogers 1933-5, 53
- 99 Virgil, Trans. Day Lewis 1983, 19
- 100 Rogers 1933-5, 53
- 101 Ovid Bk. XV Trans. Innes 1955, 346
- 102 See Kendrick 1950, 7-8
- 103 Waldstein f.177 Ed. Groos 1989, 123-125. Waldstein makes no mention of the courtyard which suggests he did not go into it at all
- 104 Howatson & Chivers Eds. 1993, 337 quoting trans. Seneca Medea 374 ff.
- 105 French 1972, 195-6
- 106 Yates 1985, 62 quoting Thomas Hughes The Misfortunes of Arthur Ed. H Grumbine, Berlin 1900, 190, (and many similar references, 59-87). (The wording of the quotation is given slightly differently in Wilson 1966, 103. Gray's was of course the Inn to which Cecil belonged.
- 107 See for example illustrations in Strong 1987 including; frontispiece, plate 82; 90, 138, 140, also the column in the "Sieve" portrait of the queen, attributed to Cornelius Ketel (c. 1580-83), now in the Pinacoteca at Siena, Strong 1987, 101, 104
- 108 Strong 1987, 13-14. SP Dom 12/31/25 is a draft proclamation that a portraitist be commissioned to make a likeness of the queen and that all others should then "follow the patron or first portraiture". The draft is in Cecil's hand, (Hake 1943, 140)
- 109 See Chapter 1
- 110 According to this, Aeneas' great-grandson, Brutus or "the Brute" was said to have reached England with his followers in the twelfth century BC British kings

-
- including King Arthur were descended or connected with his line down to Cadwallader who was driven into Wales when England was overrun by the Saxons. (Kendrick 1950, 7- 8)
- 111 Girouard 1992, 58-59
- 112 NNQ iii 413, 47, letter to the society from J. England Ewen informing them that he has a copy of Dr Powel's History of Cambria with marginal MS notes of which this was one
- 113 Cornforth, 1991, 82 and see Aubrey's comments, "And Mr Verstegan (otherwise an exceedingly ingenious gentleman) to flatter this family, would have them to be derived from the Roman Caccilii" (Aubrey Ed. Barber 1982, 69)
- 114 Erasmus Trans. Radice 1971, 67
- 115 See MacCaffrey in Bindoff Ed. 1961, 99 & 103; Johnson 121
- 116 Bibliotheca Illustrissima 1687. Jayne's reservations about the provenance of the printed works do not extend to the MSS, "most of the manuscripts were probably Burghley's" (Jayne 1965)
- 117 Greg 1935, 271
- 118 Bibliotheca Illustrissima 1687
- 119 Edmund Spenser To the Right honourable the Lo. Burghleigh in Eds. Smith & de Selincourt 1991, 410. Spenser used the same tactics to equal effect in his satirical attacks on Cecil. (See Edmund Spenser Prosopopoia: or Mother Hubberds Tale (Eds. Smith & de Selincourt 494-508)
- 120 Quoted in Kendrick 1950, 103
- 121 For example in major painting cycles at Fontainebleau and Mantua (Shever 1964, 244-246). Trojan themes were equally popular subjects for tapestries, still regarded in northern Europe at least, as the most prestigious form of wall decoration. The inventory of Henry VIII's tapestries made following his death in 1547 included "nine pieces of the history of Troy" and "three pieces of Hector" as well as a number of Trojan pieces that were originally in Wolsey's collection. (Thompson 1930, 258)
- 122 I am indebted to Dr Krista De Jonge of Leuven University for this reference given in correspondence in February 1995
- 123 SP Ireland 63/18/19
- 124 Read 1955, 352; BL Cotton MSS Titus B xiii f 173
- 125 Nicholas 1848, 125-6
- 126 SP Dom 12/181/42 printed in Gentleman's Magazine CVI Pt. I, 149
- 127 Quoted in Nichols 1823, Vol 1, 291
- 128 Yates 1985, 42 She is depicted with all the trappings of an imperial ruler within the "C" of Constantine
- 129 Anglo 1992, 3-4 and 98-124
- 130 HMC Salisbury Vol 2, No 99, 13th January 1571/2
- 131 SP Dom 12/75/58; Read 1960, 23-24
- 132 DNB, entry for Foxe (the book together with Jewel's Defence was often chained in parish churches
- 133 Quoted in Yates 1985, 42 Foxe's Acts was re-issued in 1570 when a convocation at Canterbury recommended that the book should be placed in all cathedral churches.)
- 134 French 1972, 195
- 135 Yates 1985, 134-5 devised under the auspices of Catherine de Medici, following the marriage of her son, Charles IX to Elizabeth of Austria, the granddaughter of Charles V. As discussed in chapter one, Francus was the subject of Ronsard's epic poem around which the programme was devised in collaboration with Nicholas

-
- Houel who wrote to Cecil about the works of art in the same year. (SP Dom
 Addenda Elizabeth (p371) 20/89)
 136 Read 1960, 51-65
 137 "The Duke with all his train, to the number of forty, have been entertained here...
 each in their degrees, as is to be affirmed that the like hath not been seen in any
 man's memory" Cecil, who gave a feast for them on Midsummer's Eve, wrote to
 Walsingham of the delegation, who were lodged across the road from Cecil House at
 Somerset House (Read 1960, 76-77)
 138 See B.R. Smith 1977, 110
 139 Quoted in Kendrick 1950, 103, see fn 119 above
 140 Girouard 1992 Pt II, 59
 141 Vitruvius Bk. VII Ch. v, Trans. Hicky Morgan 1960, 210-211
 142 Summerson 1959, 118 (the surveyors recorded that it was the "King's royal arms"
 that were set over them, so they may have dated from James' time., but equally,
 this may have been added to existing work. Summerson's proposition is that "it
 may be permissible to read Queen's arms"
 143 Turquet (Thesis) 1983, 200
 144 Professor Michael Jeanneret, University of Geneva. Outside the Inside Seminar
 in a series entitled Boundaires Warwick University, March 5 1993
 145 Thomson 1987, 116. This was formerly the Hotel des Ligneris, the mansion of the
 President of the Parliament
 146 Turquet (Thesis) 1983, 144 and Hollstein [1954] Vol 4, 47
 147 Turquet (Thesis) 1983, 144-145
 148 It must be noted that in March 1693/4, Antonio Verrio was paid £5 10s 0d "for wk
 done in ye Inner Court"(Exeter MSS special drawer 5415/A/24 Verrio papers) and
 later in the same year bills totalling £48 2s 0d "in full satisfaction for painting
 the middle court"(Exeter MSS E5415/A/25 Verrio papers) were paid to him. The
 figures shown on Haynes drawing would be compatible with the great mythological
 cycles Verrio was undertaking in the interior of the house, and they could
 represent painted trompe l'oeil panels. However, there is no mention of a subject
 matter as there is for Verrio's interior works and their placing on the walls is very
 arbitrary. Nor is there is any attempt at fictive architecture as one would expect
 from the interior scenes and Verrio's customary style of work. There appear to be
 no other examples of anything similar by Verrio elsewhere (See Croft Murray 1962
 Vol 1) They do not even have decorative borders, unlike the panels shown above
 the niches under the loggia. These were almost certainly painted rather than
 three-dimensional, and maybe associated with the work he was doing in the
 courtyard as there is no sign of any relief features above the niches which can still
 be seen from the rear of the lead walk above, behind Gandy Deering's corridor.
 149 The irregular positioning of the internal wall dividing T/033 from T/034, (which
 is still in existence), in relation to the west window under the loggia (WT/033/4)
 suggests an accurate account in this area by Thorpe. Furthermore shallow blocked
 recesses that equate to the windows shown by Thorpe under both the loggias
 feature on Haynes ground-floor plan. The figure of Pallas shown under the north
 pavilion loggia, must in fact have occupied one of these recesses. As discussed
 earlier, outlines of door and window openings found behind the present south
 courtyard corridor support the accuracy of such details on Thorpe's plan.
 (Wilson (unpublished) 1982-1994, Vol II Pt 10)
 150 Hearn Ed. 1995, 208
 151 Henderson in Gent Ed. 1995, 134
 152 The Greenwich fountain had figures of six "boyes" 2 ft high (King's Works 4, 108)
 The Theobalds fountain is mentioned in the Parliamentary Survey 1650,
 E317/Herts/26 f 26 .

-
- 153 Whinney 1964, 10
154 Girouard 1992, Pt II,
155 See Blunt 1982 147-148
156 The First Earl Mordant's will suggests that his monument was to be erected by
1563, but Drury questions a date so much earlier than the other tombs in the
group, and speculates whether it too does not date from the 1570s (Drury 1982,
25)
157 Illustrated in RCHME (unpublished) report on Drayton House, Northamptonshire,
NBR File No 61863
158 Baker 18 Vol 1, 348
159 I am grateful to Margaret Sutherland and Bruce Bailey, who examined the
stonework of the chimneypiece, for these observations.
160 Drury 1982, 25
161 Parl. Survey E317/Herts/26 f.26. The queen as Venus or replacing Venus was also
a trope regularly employed in various artistic media (See Yates 1985, 32, 73)
162 See quote above from Ovid Bk. XV Trans. Innes 1955, 346
163 Lengthy details are printed in Nichols 1823 Vol 1, 151-189 Triumphs of the
Muses, compiled from Harl. MSS 7037,109 and material "communicated to Mr
Peck, from a MS in the hands of Roger Gale Esq." (fn 1, 151) Cecil obviously
understood the two-way nature of a sustained event in which the queen was
presented to the university and vice versa, and was clear about the image he
wanted conveyed "My desire is that two things maye speciallye appear in that
Universitie: order and learning. "Nichols 1823 Vol 1, 151-152 He took similar
trouble when the university entertained the queen once more, this time at Audley
End in 1578 (Nichols 1823 Vol 2, 110.)
164 Butler, M. "Private and Occasional Drama" in Eds. Braunmuller & Hattaway 1990,
1990 128
165 Walpole, 1927-28, 58
166 Vitruvius Bk. v chap. vii, Trans. Hicky Morgan 1960, 150
167 Serlio the Second Book Tutte l-opera d'architettura Ch 3 Fol. 25
168 Rosand 1982, 151
169 Vitruvius Bk. v chap. vii, Trans. Hicky Morgan 1960, 150
170 This opening performance was itself staged for a foreign delegation from Japan
(Schiavo 1987, 13)
171 Rosand 1982, 148
172 Butler, M. "Private and Occasional Drama" in Eds. Braunmuller & Hattaway 1990,
129
173 Butler, M. "Private and Occasional Drama" in Eds. Braunmuller & Hattaway 1990,
129
174 Ashley 1970 185-6, see Chapter 4
175 Strong 1987, 69
176 Nichols 1828, Vol 1, 70
177 Rosand 1982, 153

CHAPTER SIX : METAMORPHOSIS: THE HOUSE OF BURGHLEY: PART 1
1573-1588

Cecil's public metamorphosis into Lord Burghley, Lord Treasurer of England, Knight of the Garter, was fully effected by the middle of 1572. Privately the pattern of his domestic life had also changed since the mid-1560s when, after seventeen years of marriage, he and Mildred finally had a surviving son born in 1563. In effect Cecil now had two 'eldest' sons, Thomas by his first wife, and Robert by his second.¹ Nineteen-year-old Thomas, having been recalled from the Continent ~~was~~ secured the seat for Stamford for the short Parliament of 1563. Cecil locked him into the dynastic chain by arranging his marriage into "stock of honour" to the well-connected local heiress, Dorothy Neville, and by "planting" them at Burghley House.² Burghley ceased to be the home of Cecil and his second family - he would never in future spend more than a few days a year there. Mildred Cecil's interest in the house was at an end, but for William Cecil it took on a far more significant role. By early 1573 Thomas was writing to his father of a third son born at Burghley. The property became the "House of Burghley" that was to be occupied by successive heads of the family and their immediate male heirs in an unbroken line until the 1970s. The male line of Cecil's principal dynasty was assured and Burghley House was now central to the long-term as well as to the immediate ambitions of William Cecil. Thus, despite his absence from the place, Cecil's interest in the house intensified rather than diminished.

Certain aspects of this transformation at Burghley are radical departures, but on the whole the final concept suggests an architectural imagination vigorously applied to re-thinking and extending the possibilities of conventional form and planning. The more traditional terms of reference in which these innovations are carefully framed result in a psychological and symbolic resonance which is principally one of stability and order, of continuity and permanence, of renewal referencing an extended heritage, rather than 'newness' disconnected from its past. As a result, the more innovative aspects of the

building are easily overlooked. Its metamorphosis was that of a new form emerging from an existing body in which its substructure was already inherent .

The key decisions governing the second and final major phase of Cecil's building activity at Burghley must have been formulated intellectually at an early stage of its planning. In purely abstract architectural terms, the most important of these depended upon the existence of a pre-conceived design that embraced the whole building, transmuting the potential of the existing structure. It was an ambitious and sophisticated plan, especially for one founded on an existing house. The main body of the building (excluding the new great hall width of the east range) was to be treated not as a series of separate outward-facing fronts and inward-facing courtyard facades, but as a more fundamentally unified three-dimensional whole. While each front was to be symmetrical about its own centrally emphasized axis, the entire courtyard block of the house was also planned to be symmetrically disposed about the ceremonial west entrance axis. The masses of the north and south ranges, therefore, were to be organised to mirror one another.

The first major decision of the master plan was to retain the basic matrix of the courtyard house that had been established on a substantial scale by the end of Cecil's first building phase. The transformation of the house was not to be a U-turn, but would be effected by building upwards and outwards around the ample space of the courtyard, in effect, therefore, the second "phase" of a sustained architectural policy.

Secondly, and on the back of this decision, came the plan to expand eastwards to create a double pile range by building a new great hall and great kitchen onto the east wall of the old house, leaving the courtyard undisturbed. But equally crucial to the overall plan, was the determination to give this new outer width of the range a separate architectural identity from that of the main body of the building.

Thirdly, in the expansion westwards the new west range appears to have been built directly to the west of the earlier range, but here replacing the only part of the house where the old fabric was largely demolished. The former ground-floor chambers of the west range were replaced by single bay loggias to either side of the entrance arch on the courtyard side. The eastern front of these bays almost certainly followed the original east wall of the former west range. As at the east end, therefore, the original dimensions of the courtyard were also unaltered.

The fourth major development was to remove the ridged roofs of the north and south ranges, inferred to have covered these ranges as the evidence indicates was the case in the west and east. These roofs were replaced with virtually flat, lead roofs above a second, (now walled) storey. The leads added a new spatial and architectural dimension to the house providing not only an extra full-height floor below, but another complete layer of recreational space above allowing for the addition of a sumptuous architectural roofscape. They were to be reached by the impressive Roman stairway in the north range and were obviously treated as an area of considerable importance; an architectural climax that gave visual command over the whole estate and beyond.

The urge was for external coherence rather than rigid uniformity and, for the most part, this was closely related to a lucid plan of internal spatial organisation. Some innovative developments of established features such as the major stairways and the long gallery were introduced into the parade route of the house. Meanwhile, the trend in domestic planning towards the division of private and public space which had started with the withdrawal from the great hall, appears to have been taken a radical stage further. The house was planned so that its private side could function virtually autonomously.

Difficulties arising from the irregularity of the earlier building are clearly evident from the archaeology of the existing fabric and anomalies revealed by the modern measured plan, and help to explain a number of the mysteries of the house. The failures of the

executants to solve some of the problems encountered in translating the rational theory of the conceptual plans into the reality of the final structure are apparent. So too, is the ingenuity exercised in overcoming others. While the broad sweep of the architecture may succeed, much of the detail was compromised by these circumstances and it is to these that one has to look for clues to the sequence of work and implementation of the design.

The Overall Plan

The retention of the irregular courtyard (discussed briefly above & see Plan 11) proved to be a limitation that caused most of the difficulties and ultimately frustrated the complete realisation of the holistic architectural plan. The problem was two-fold, firstly that the courtyard fronts are not axially aligned with their counterparts on the outward faces of the building, and secondly that the east and west courtyard fronts were themselves not precisely aligned or parallel. The complications this causes can be illustrated by looking at a more exaggerated example in the plan of Gidea Hall (Plan 25a) where, unlike Burghley, there has been no attempt to mask the discrepancies between inner and outer fronts. In order for the range on the west side of the plan to have a central courtyard opening, (emphasised by the surrounding steps) it has had to be placed so that it is a full bay width to the south of the exterior central opening on the outward-facing side of the range. Similar difficulties arose at Hill Hall and as a result the courtyard fronts are not symmetrical about their central axis (Plan 25b). At Burghley a less acute discrepancy occurs between the frontispiece facing outwards on the north range and the courtyard pavilion on the inward front of the range evident in Thorpe's plan (Plan F1 to either side of T/034). The slighter difference on either side of in the south range is easier to see on Thorpe's first-floor plan (Plan F2 to either side of T/115 & T/116).

Thorpe overlooked the discrepancy in the east double pile range altogether. In fact the centre of the east facing secondary hall porch would have been some 8ft (2.4m) south of the central point of the east exterior front.³ Meanwhile, on the courtyard side the clock-

tower frontispiece as we have seen, is sited slightly to the south of the entrance into the saloon (049) which in turn is on a direct axis with the screen's passage of the great hall on the outer side (marked A & B on axis line, Plan 3d). This is still not enough to align it directly with the west entrance arch into the courtyard (marked C on axis line, Plan 3d) even though this has been fudged northwards by making the south stair tower (022) wider north/south than its counterpart (029) in the north-west angle.⁴ Nevertheless these adjustments are sufficient to deceive the eye into reading the courtyard as symmetrical.

Buildings out of square in this way are a commonplace of sixteenth century architecture where earlier buildings were so frequently incorporated. Again one can look at a more exaggerated example in the courtyard plan of Kirby Hall, almost certainly built thus due to the assimilation of earlier structures (Plan 26). Despite the extreme distortion of the rectangular form, because the dominant features at either end of the courtyard are approximately on an axis, when actually in the space one reads it as a regular rectangle. At Burghley, the three-dimensional problems in effecting the symmetrical master-plan, stemming from the two-dimensional irregularity of the ground plan, are most clearly manifest on the roof.

The original roof-line of the south front of the house on completion of Cecil's second building phase matched that retained today on the north front. (Plan F6 & Fig 6.1a). On the north front the change in height between the taller lateral bays adjacent to the angle towers and the lower central width of the range is still clearly expressed. The former arrangement on the south front can be seen in Figs. A.1, A.4, A.5 & A.6c, although the central section of the front had already been sheathed in a new layer of masonry at the end of the seventeenth century, which is shown breaking forward to either end of the loggia section. The further alteration to create the illusion of a standardized roof-line across the whole front between the angle towers was made by Capability Brown, c. 1763-1765, as part of his extensive work for Brownlow Cecil, 9th Earl of Exeter.⁵ As

with the gardens, Brown contoured the outline of the house, increasing the height of the wall below the balustrading in the central section of the front by some 6ft 6ins (2m) above the level of the actual roof-line, so that it agreed with that of the lateral widths.⁶ The new wall included an upper tier of false panes added to the windows, already made into dummies at the end of the seventeenth century.⁷ The cresting on the pavilion which, according to the Vanderbank cartouche and the 'Burghley Bowl' was similar to that on the courtyard pavilions behind, is not shown by Caldwell and had definitely been removed when Haynes made his drawing in 1755. This was most probably abolished as part of the extensive remodelling of this front carried out at the end of the seventeenth century for the 5th Earl of Exeter when the wall was sheathed. Brown's drawing of the south elevation with "the intended alterations" shows that he proposed to the 9th Earl that this should be reinstated, but in the event the uniform balustrade was constructed to run rather monotonously across the whole facade between the towers (Fig.A.7 & 6.1b).

Behind this false front, however, the earlier building history is still apparent (Fig.6.2). The lines of the junctions between the higher roof level of the outer bays of the south and north ranges and the lower, central sections are marked on the roof plan, showing how they formed symmetrical blocks at each outward corner of the house towards the angle towers, with the exception of the north-east block, which is slightly longer from west to east (Plan F6).

The points of change in roof levels related not just to one another but to the wider architectural organisation of the house. At the western end of both south and north ranges the higher sections are aligned with the east walls of the staircase towers in the west angles of the courtyard. This meant they were in line with the leading edge of the courtyard front of the west range (Plans F1 & F2). The situation is repeated at the eastern end of the south range where the change of roof level is in line with the leading edge of the east, courtyard loggia.

On the south front the result of this plan to create symmetrical corner 'pavilions' was entirely satisfactory (Fig.6.3). The junctions of the roof levels came in ordered positions above the wall between two tiers of windows (W/T117/1 & W/T118/1 etc. and W/T114/5 & W/T115/1 etc.). The higher lateral bays defined the termini of the central loggia block, where the present wall now breaks forward at either end. The synchronization between the courtyard architecture and the outward facing architecture was thus clearly stressed by the change of levels that align with principal features on either side.

This plan thus reveals a considerable degree of architectural sophistication. Furthermore, the creation of strong angle blocks gives a much more assured and stable appearance to the building than the narrow corner towers on their own would achieve. It brings the organisation of the masses of the building close to one of the most popular plan types of contemporary French architecture in which angle pavilions are strongly accented, as is evident from numerous plans and perspective drawings illustrated by Serlio, du Cerceau, and de l'Orme and which was also employed at Theobalds (Fig. 6.22)

At Burghley, there appears to be no structural or functional reason for a change of roof levels over the outer bays of the lateral ranges at these points, creating large void spaces internally at either end of the south range and at the western end of the north range. There is, however, a very cogent functional reason for the change at the eastern end of the north range. In order to accommodate an imposing stair route to the leads, which could not have been contained within the angle tower (T/005), what amounts to another stair "tower" in the form of a pavilion had to be built (T/036). This is the position of the Roman stair which had to be one storey higher than the flat roof onto which it leads on its western side. With a grand stair planned for this position and designed to co-ordinate with the rationale of the wider architectural scheme, the only way to achieve overall external symmetry in the main body of the house about its central axis was to clone the arrangement at its other three corners.

On Thorpe's plans the west wall of the Roman stairs (between T/036 & T/035) is indeed drawn in line with the leading edge of the courtyard loggia which in turn is aligned with the west wall of the south stairs, and therefore with the junction of the differing roof heights above. If the wall of the Roman stairs was in fact as shown on Thorpe, then the change in roof levels at the eastern end of the north range would equate precisely to that at the eastern end of the south range. As was undoubtedly the intention, all four corners of the main block of the house would have had symmetrical outward-facing outlines to north and south. The level changes across the width of the roofs would have occurred symmetrically, and at rational points on the courtyard sides aligned with the east and west loggias.

On the modern plan, however, one can see that in reality, the west wall of the Roman stairs lies just over 3ft (1m) to the west of the courtyard loggia (Plan F3). The result as built is that the roof-line level change on the north range at this point is not in fact quite mimicked in the south range. What is more, because the east end of the courtyard is not parallel with the west, the real discrepancy is even greater. On the north front the higher bays at the eastern and western ends do not present a symmetrical pairing because the east bay is longer than the west by over 6ft (2m) on this side.

Several possibilities are raised by these anomalies. Firstly, it could be that the lower flights of the Roman stair were already in existence as part of the first phase of Cecil's building. If this was the case, the miscalculation of the amount of space available for the stair could not be rectified. The uppermost flight must belong to the later phase because it would have led nowhere before the leads were in place.⁸ A first-phase date for this imposing feature seems unlikely however, with the earlier hall and the other principal chambers in the southern half of the house. The stairs mentioned in the documents in connection with the hall, chamber and chapel bear no relationship to the position of the Roman stair. The 'Hog's hall' (T/001) that appears to have been part of the cooking area

of the kitchen offices in the first phase of Cecil's building would also have cut the stair off from the ground floor of the east range. Mildred's suite may have had a decorated stair, but her accommodation could have been 'avoyded' to provide prestige guest lodging accessible from the great hall in the event of a progress visit. However, for Cecil to have had such a high-status feature reserved purely for his private use and quite out of the reach of a wider audience seems implausible.

The stylistic similarities between the Roman stair and the north frontispiece have been noted above. Furthermore, amongst the symbols in the barrel vault decoration, including over the lower flights, are crescent moons. These, as can be seen on the west entrance vault, were emblems of the Cheke family arms of Cecil's first wife, Mary (Fig. 5.4a) and it seems far more probable that they would have been included when her son Thomas was in residence, after 1564, rather than when her successor, Mildred, was mistress of the house. The symbol also features on the outer soffit of the 1587 north frontispiece at the very point of entry to the private side of the house occupied by Thomas.⁹

The complex geometry required to manipulate the square and cipher pattern of the stair vault into the unstandardized spaces of the various flights not only shows great skill, it suggests that the whole stair had to be fitted in some way into a pre-determined space which may not have been entirely consistent with the conceptual plan (Fig. 6.4) The disposition of the doorway leading from the stairs to the 'Hog's hall' (001) suggests that it has been opened-up through a pre-existing and extremely thick wall, rather than being conceived as part of an original design. The first flight of the stair has been lowered at some stage by one step, evident in the surrounding masonry and the height of the finely crafted handrail relative to the stair by comparison with the other flights, and it could never have been contiguous with the earlier, lower level of the 'Hog's hall'. The vaults over the lobby at the foot of the stair, meanwhile, are false plaster constructions which may be later additions.

If the mass of the southern part of the east wall of the Roman stairs was part of the structural fabric of the earlier building phase, or even of the earlier house taken over by Cecil, then it would define the eastern limit of where a new stair could be sited in the north range. The thinness of the wall on the west side of the stair (O36), which, as one can see from the modern plan, is slighter than the other lateral walls in the north range, also suggests an effort to maximize the space available for the stairs, without taking the wall any further to the west (Plan F3). So too does the rectangular plan, which with its long and short flights is a hybrid form of the French rampe sur rampe arrangement crossed with the square plan of the l'escalier à retours.¹⁰ The width of the stairs, meanwhile, could not have been reduced without forfeiting the imposing impression they were undoubtedly intended to make.

Altogether this would have made it impossible for the west wall of the stairs, which on its top flight defines the limit of the taller outer bays of the north-west range, to be further to the east. Thus it could not in reality be in line either with the leading edge of the courtyard loggia, or the intended mirror image on the south range.

As is evident from Thorpe, minor discrepancies and misalignments were easily overlooked when drawing up plans of existing buildings in the sixteenth century. They are not altogether uncommon in the twentieth. Peter Kemp's letter to Cecil in September 1575 - asking for the "upright of the face" of the house for the men to work from - confirms that the architectural designs for major structural work were coming from the patron in London.¹¹ If the ambitious overall development plan for Burghley was conceived off-site, and calculated from survey plans of the existing building, which like Thorpe's, may not have disclosed some of its irregularities, then it is easy to see how such difficulties in translating the concept to a material structure occurred. As Palladio observed, "Great care ought to be taken in the placing of the stair-cases, because it is no small difficulty to find a situation fit for them, and that doth not impede the remaining part of the fabrick."¹² Such a

situation may have been found in theory on the plan but could not be accommodated quite as intended in the building itself.

The architecture of a courtyard house, and more especially a courtyard house with roofscape, is experienced from a greater variety of viewpoints than in any other building plan. From the roof one can see not only the courtyard elevations but the overall map of the whole house laid out under foot. The lengths that are taken at Burghley to organise the mass of the building into a three-dimensionally harmonious form which is clearly expressed at roof level, appear to reflect a keen awareness of this. The changes in roof levels at the four corners were defined by stone balustrading across the width of the roofs, still partially extant at the south-east, north-east and north-west junctions (Fig. 6.5). The balustrading shown in Fig 6.6a sits above what was the leading edge of the north-west courtyard stair tower before Gandy Deering's work (1828-33). This same balustrading viewed from the courtyard side can be seen on Garrard's view (6.6b). The scars of the return balustrade that matched this on the north side of the junction are clearly evident (Fig.6.5b & Plan F6).

At the equivalent point on the roof of the south range, the roof level of the higher bays has been subsequently lowered, so that the wall to the west of the junction, like Brown's wall to the east, is now merely a screen. However, the surviving engaged baluster, marking the point where the balustrade returned along the leading edge of the earlier higher roof level, in exactly the same manner as that across the north range, confirms that here too there was originally a change in roof levels (Fig.6.7).

As far as the chronological sequence of the second building phase is concerned the construction of the upper flight of the Roman stair, and almost certainly its whole entity, must have been towards the very end of the campaign. In which case the problems outlined above would only have come to light after the plan for higher lateral bays had been put into effect at the other angles of the building, or at least the two on the south side.

The clearest evidence that the wall of the upper, second floor of the whole north range was added in c.1587, at the same date as the frontispiece, is apparent from the junctions between the frontispiece and the main north face of the range. Between their two lower architraves these are somewhat clumsy. Moreover, the profiles of the architrave do not match one another, and it is clear that the frontispiece at these levels is secondary to the existing wall. By contrast, at second-floor level both faces have the same more refined architrave profiles that do not occur elsewhere on the outward fronts of the main body of the house and which peter out at the end of the lower section of the front (Figs 6.8 & 6.1).¹³ Here the junction is cleanly effected as one would expect from work that was built to co-ordinate at the same date. This is consistent with the proposal that formerly ridge roofs sprang from the ceiling level of the first floor (defined externally by the central architrave) which were replaced by the upper part of the wall.

This being the case, the lead walks above the north range, onto which the Roman stairs opened, can only have been completed at the same time as the frontispiece, dated 1587. They would, therefore, have been the final phase of the building, referred to by Thomas Cecil when he wrote to his father on 27th August 1587 that "your lordship's buildings go on very fast this year, and I hope by Michaelmas they will be ready to cover with lead."¹⁴

If the north range was the last to be completed, where then did the second phase of building start? The south range can fairly confidently be ruled out because the development of its major new feature, the south stair chamber, makes no sense without the new great hall, either logistically or in scale, relative to the old hall. The west range which contained the long gallery on the other hand, was only nearing completion in September 1578 and almost certainly building did not start until 1575.¹⁵ As discussed in the previous chapter, however, the broader political circumstances as well as the building activity elsewhere in the locality strongly suggest a date earlier rather than later in the

1570s for a new great hall, possibly connected with a new or remodelled porch on the courtyard side, under construction in 1573. The expansion of the east range that embodied and symbolized the hospitality of the house that would provide a splendid introduction to its interior would seem to be the most logical starting point for the second phase of building.

The East Range

In June 1573 when Kemp informed Cecil that he had taken delivery of the second-hand lead recovered from Fotheringhay chapel he continued that he had "caused 60 trees to be felled for you in the forest".¹⁶ Presumably this referred to Rockingham Forest and, as this does not appear to be timber for selling, it was most probably part of the gearing-up in preparation for major building works.¹⁷

The logical order of work within the east range would have been to re-develop the kitchen and kitchen offices while the old hall could still function, and then to start on the new hall once these were in place to service it. The fabric of the present great kitchen does not appear to have been altered significantly since the completion of Cecil's work, although the lantern, where it is exposed above roof level, is a sensitive modern reconstruction of 1984 (Fig. 6.9).¹⁸ The great stone vault spanning the main body of the kitchen springs from four piers, each bearing nine ribs, and supporting the octagonal louvre in the centre (Fig. 6.10). The construction is of the highest quality with extremely fine jointing. It is flanked by a massive Gothic arch on the west side, forming an alcove beyond. This may incorporate part of the earlier kitchen. The profile of the plinth of the south-west pier matches that of a surviving fragment of another pier, now largely obscured by subsequent masonry at the south-west corner of 007 (Fig 6.11). This is directly behind the kitchen face of the north-west pier from which the Gothic arch and the present kitchen vault spring. The base of this pier, on the kitchen side, is now hidden by later brickwork, but the remaining fragment still exposed in 007 may represent its outer

face. The plinths are set at the same level, and were similarly constructed of two courses of masonry.¹⁹ They may have been the principal supporters of an earlier structure.

Thorpe's plan indicates that the masonry of the east wall that is secondary to the pier (in T/107), was already in existence by 1605/6. The pier on the south-west corner of the kitchen, meanwhile, has been chopped back on its eastern side to form the doorway leading into 038. Thorpe also shows a doorway in this position with a chamfered wall on its western side (between T/002 & T/009), which suggests that this pier was also part of the pre-existing fabric of the earlier house and, very possibly, part of the stone wall base of the earlier, timber-roofed kitchen. The old kitchen, which was roofed independently from the main block of the house, would thus have had a back-to-back hearth with the 'Hog's hall' (T/001) which was originally at the same floor level. The stone-flagged floor of the present great kitchen may also date from the sixteenth century, allowing for replacements in heavily trafficked areas.

Although the stone vault of the present kitchen is Gothic in character, the ovolo profile of its ribs is similar to the vault under the west entrance arch of 1577 and those of the Roman stair landings. In the treatise which Cecil wanted to be sent from Paris,²⁰ Philibert de l'Orme recommended a high pitched pyramidal roof with a lantern above as still the most practical design for a main kitchen in order to ensure good ventilation and temperature control. He advised that the ovens should be on the west wall, as indeed they are at Burghley, so as to work most efficiently and economically according to the prevailing wind, and shows them set in an alcove which is not part of the vaulted section of the room, again as at Burghley (although not behind a screen wall as de l'Orme shows (Fig. 6.12).

Cecil did not send for de l'Orme's treatise until after 1576,²¹ so it is unlikely that he took inspiration for the plan at Burghley directly from this source, although he may well have known of the earlier, 1561 edition of the book. However, its similarities to de l'Orme's model kitchen imply that technically the kitchen at Burghley was not an

anachronism and would still have been the most practical arrangement for a space constructed with the capacity for mass catering in mind. The reconstruction of the privy kitchen at Windsor undertaken in 1574, the expenditure for which was agreed by Cecil and the Chancellor, Sir Walter Mildmay, appears to have been on similar principles with a lantern for extra light, a new chimney and impervious Purbeck marble floor.²²

The extensive kitchen offices were extended eastwards at Burghley and the earlier rooms were probably redesigned as the thickness of the walls suggest masonry rather than timber partitions mentioned in the earlier correspondence.²³ Access to the lower service areas from the hall was via a stair of thirteen steps running north/south immediately to the north of the screens passage.²⁴ The principles of the layout of the kitchen complex at Burghley in fact differ little from those recommended for corporate hospitality and conference centres of today.²⁵

At the same time, the plan used at Burghley was essentially developed from that of a medieval kitchen and its heroic scale signified the traditional canons of hospitality expected of a great house. In the Faerie Queene the kitchen was part of the guided tour of the House of Temperance, where the time-honoured hospitality is portrayed as exemplary. "Sober Alma", the lady of the house

"led her guests anone
into the kitchen rowme, ne spard for nicenesse none.
It was a vault ybuilt for great dispense,
With many raunges reard along the wall;
And one great chimney, whose long tunnel thence
The smoke forth threw"²⁶

The kitchen at Burghley was similarly included in the established tour when Waldstein visited in 1600, observing that "the great kitchen is a place fit to cook a banquet

for a king."²⁷ Indeed, when James I visited Burghley on his progress from Scotland in 1603 "all the offices in the house were set open, that every man might have free accesse to butteries, pantries, kitchins, to eat and drink in at their pleasures."²⁸ These offices conformed precisely to the pattern that Henry Wotton was to recommend in his treatise of 1624: "by the natural hospitality of England, the Buttery must be more visible; and we need perchance for our Ranges, a more spacious and luminous Kitchen". This arrangement, Wotton argued, was preferable to Italian-inspired plans in which these offices were relegated to the basement.²⁹

The great chimney stack for the kitchen is taken up the external face of the north wall, where the prevailing south-west wind would have directed smoke and fumes away from the house. This flue, the only one expressed on an outside wall and with six chimneys, must be that described by Waldstein "in one place six [chimneys] are joined together, making a buttress for the house." (Fig 6.13)³⁰

The kitchen and attendant offices were on a fitting scale to complement the new great hall which measures 68ft x 30ft (20.7m x 9.1m)³¹ including the screens passage, and to offer the hospitality it signalled, whether real or represented. The hall was larger than that of Theobalds, completed by c.1571, at some 48ft x 27ft (14.5m x 8.2m) but, as Girouard has noted, the halls of houses in the courtier belt tended to be smaller than those further afield from London.³² That of Holdenby of c. 1575, despite Hatton's claim that the house was modelled on Theobalds,³³ was closer to Burghley at approximately 70ft x 30ft. (21.3m x 9.1m). Kenilworth, of course, retained John of Gaunt's magnificent and vast great hall of 89ft x 45ft (27m x 13.7m),³⁴ while Bisham boasted that formerly belonging to the Knights Templar, measuring c. 52ft x 33ft (15.5m x 10.1m).³⁵

Facing outwards to the wider but at the same time parochial world, clearly visible from the local thoroughfare of the ancient "Forty Foot Way", the hall presents a familiar face with a familiar covering of local Collyweston slates. Its gable end with the huge late

gothic-style window is clearly recognisable as that of a great hall. Thorpe shows a six-light window with a similar mullion arrangement here, and the Vanderbank cartouche shows a window which approximates to the existing fenestration. If the present window is not the sixteenth-century original as its relationship to the surrounding interior masonry suggests, its design is most probably similar in character.

The apparently reactionary design of the hall could be interpreted as a return to the medieval pattern of domestic planning, where each specialized part of the house might be expressed as a separate unit of self-contained architecture. Equally, however, one can see Cecil's decision as a self-consciously plotted solution which was both architecturally and politically expedient, and wholly appropriate to its circumstances. Internally it allowed Cecil to retain the traditional magnificence of a double height hammer-beamed hall without the architectural tension created by trying to straight-jacket it into a structure organised according to totally different architectural principles, as happens at Longleat. Evidently the great hall was still the object of admiration to foreign visitors such as Waldstein, who thought it "extremely large, its room vaulted and most beautifully made".³⁶

Standing alongside the thoroughly "modern" south front with its fashionable classical loggia, the great hall's separate identity does not disturb the symmetry of its architecture, and reassuringly proclaimed that the traditional values of hospitality offered to all comers, the marque of true nobility, were still present in the modern mansion. Lewis notes a similarly ethical and stylistic decorum, within the dialectics of its own culture, in Palladio's influential early building at Piombino Dese for Zorzon Cornaro, where "a persuasively indigenous style" was adopted as "a conscious proponent of old-fashioned virtues of landed proprietorship, using the same iconographic associations of antique republican simplicity."³⁷

No other new Elizabethan halls built for private houses appear to have been expressed externally in this way. But it continued to be the prevalent pattern in halls

designed for corporate use such as the university colleges and the inns of court. Likewise, the successive banqueting houses at Whitehall, including that of Inigo Jones, which assumed the great hall's traditional role of feasting ceremonial, were put up as autonomous structures.

Returning to the fabric of the hall, the extent of the projection of its south wall in front of the roof gable is unusual. The generous lead walk thus created at roof level is just over 4ft (1.25m) wide. The extreme thickness of the wall may have been intended to counter the danger of racking in the roof timbers and to act as buttressing during construction. The nature of the construction implies that the shaped timbers were assembled bay by bay on a scaffold, and that the north stone gable was only built after this was complete.³⁸ The bay widths of the roof are not consistent, suggesting, as so much of the detail of the architecture does, that there was a discrepancy between a plan emanating from the patron and his design team in London and the details of the actual building circumstances. There is also evidence in the timbers of the central bay of the roof that at one time, like the great kitchen, the great hall had a lantern or louvre.³⁹

As can be seen on the RCHME plan (3b), at the western end the south wall of the hall has had to be sharply indented to form the junction with the south-east tower of the main body of the house. Between the upper and lower bands of the architrave at first-floor level, however, the construction is adjusted so that the wall is built straight above this level (Fig 6.14b). This strongly suggests that below the south-east angle tower pre-dates the hall, the wall of which has had to be distorted accordingly, whilst if the tower was heightened, or was planned to be heightened, when the hall was constructed the anomaly could have been disguised at the upper level.

Facing eastwards, the facade would have been masked from the parochial view by the terraces and the mount to the south of it. It was a contained part of the private culture of the house for which the expected audience was that of the cosmopolitan world of the court,

and invited local 'society', most of whom were also sometime courtiers.⁴⁰ As a result the nature of its rhetorical style, like that of the courtyard, appears to have been very different from that of its exposed south front.

Thorpe records a symmetrically organised east front, completely so if the penthouse at the north-east corner (T/008 & T/003) is removed so that the wall line is as shown on the first-floor plan. This extension was an afterthought, which must have been added between 1600 and 1605/6 for it hides, at ground-floor level, the multiple chimney stack that was so noticeable to Waldstein in 1600. What is now an interior window inside this storeroom, which was of four lights (W/008/2 on Plan 3a), has been partly altered to a doorway. It accords with the position of a four-light window shown on Thorpe's ground-floor plan (W/T008/2).

Without the end penthouse, according to Thorpe, the original elevation had three regularly spaced projecting bays of equal size and a pattern of fenestration in the rhythm A-B-CC-B-CC-B-A. Like every other front at Burghley, this gives a central emphasis, symmetrically disposed about its central axis (Fig 6.15)

The eastern hall porch, leading as one would expect, from the screens passage, formed the central projecting bay as shown by Thorpe. It was entered from the side as for example the main hall porches at Broughton Castle (by 1554), Chastleton House and Aston Hall (both early seventeenth century) where in each case symmetry was intended. Where Thorpe shows this porch is now the single-storey corridor to Brown's Orangery. The present projecting bay immediately to the north of it (010), which is part of what is now the chapel at first floor-level (109), lies beyond the body of the hall (Fig.6.16).⁴¹

Thorpe's plans show the building as shorter from north to south than it actually is, and as also noted above, the screens passage does not, in fact, occur in the centre of the front, but some 8ft (2.4m) to the south. However, as it was more likely to have been

viewed obliquely and fairly closely from the hall end rather than kitchen end of the range, this discrepancy would not register significantly. In contrast to the courtyard elevations there were no other buildings against which to align it visually. Nor was there an extended axial approach as on the north and west sides and almost certainly on the south.⁴²

The three projecting bays shown by Thorpe all opened onto double-height spaces - the hall, the screens passage, (where no gallery is shown above) and the great kitchen - so would most naturally have been glazed as single windows running the full height from the ground floor to the first floor, as does the hall bay today. A window to the south of the hall bay is now blocked. This approximates to the window shown on Thorpe (W/T012/8), but also to a window shown on Brown's plan of the house showing proposed alterations of 1756. There is no window here on Haynes plan (Plans F9, F10). Brown's more radical proposal for moving the fireplace in the hall to the west wall was not carried out, but the sill of this window would be far too high to match its sixteenth-century counterpart at the other end of the range as Thorpe's symmetrical disposition of windows on this front suggests was the case. Other subsequent alterations have taken place in this part of the hall where a door was also inserted at some stage. This in turn must have been blocked before the bookcases, imported from Tongerlo Abbey in Belgium in c.1830 were installed in the hall.⁴³

The complication of the window level arises because the ground level at the north end of the range is approximately 5ft 6ins (1.6m) lower than that at the south. If the difference was taken up by the plinth, as happens on the south front, the southern-most window of the hall would therefore have had to be a long window, like that of the bay, in order to match W/008/2 at the north end of the range, which would be similar to what occurs at either end of the contemporary hall range at Kirby (see Fig 6.15 & Fig 6.18a).

The present hall bay window is larger than that shown by Thorpe whose measurements of the hall itself are otherwise accurate. The odd disposition, whereby the

hall chimneys stand over the head of the window bay, suggests that it may have been extended northwards. The windows of the undercroft beneath the hall, which pre-date the brick vault of the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century, also corroborate the layout of Thorpe's plan.⁴⁴ The window below the bay does not extend across its full width and does not relate to the disposition of the mullions above. The other three windows (apart from one light of that at the southern end) are now hidden externally above ground by subsequent alterations, but they approximate to the above-ground window positions shown on Thorpe. A narrow aperture in the cellar beneath the south wall of the screens passage revealed a section of wall veering southwards from the main wall line which also agrees with the detail of the above ground wall line shown by Thorpe (adjacent to W/T012/3).⁴⁵

No buttresses are shown in Thorpe, but corner buttresses at either end of the east front and the side buttresses on the east wall had been added before Vanderbank (1680s), who shows the south buttress (Fig A.I), which would have combated structural weakness caused by the lack of solid masonry in the wall which supported the huge weight of the Collyweston stone slate roofs.⁴⁶ A straight joint between the north-east corner buttress, where the masonry does not line through with the main east wall, indicates a later addition (Fig. 6.17). The same is true, though to a less marked degree, of the south corner buttress. Nor do the turrets that cap them conform to the design of the other outward-facing turrets. They have rather weaker-looking embroccated stone roofs whereas the rest, like the kitchen vault, have superbly constructed stone roofs with fine butt jointing. The stone mouldings encircling the buttress turrets ape the finer profiles of the courtyard architraves, rather than the bolder outlines of the external fronts that are otherwise consistently followed on the outward-facing turrets of the main block of the house.⁴⁷

The whole of the east hall wall above ground from the bay northwards may in fact be a reconstruction, or an encasement of the earlier wall, as happened on the south front.⁴⁸ The window behind the chimney-breast was glazed at some point, evident from the holes

in the stonework for the glazing bars. This can only ever have been a dummy window. Possibly the other two extant blind windows were similarly always blocked from the interior, and were merely made as dummies when the wall was thickened, to retain the illusion of a wall of glass from the outside, despite the structural body-building behind.⁴⁹

Overall the sixteenth-century front, as detailed by Thorpe, would have presented a huge amount of glass relative to wall in the manner of other fashionable Northamptonshire houses of the 1570s. The south front of Holdenby, for example, where glass was used "more daringly than any other house in England, and probably in Europe", dates from the mid 1570s.⁵⁰ Its "Lightsomeness" was one of the qualities admired by Cecil in 1579.⁵¹ If the reconstruction at Burghley approximates to the sixteenth-century front, then it indeed bears marked similarities to the courtyard front of the hall range at Kirby Hall, which also masked kitchen offices behind one side of its facade. Further afield geographically, though not politically, the new building at Kenilworth completed in time for the queen's visit in 1575, was described by Laneham "a day time on every side so glittering by glasses; a nights, by continual brightness of candle, fire and torch-light through the lightsome windows..."⁵²

The apparent effort made to achieve symmetry and dazzle on this front, in sharp contrast to the south face of the hall, strongly suggests Cecil was attempting to have the best of both worlds, old and new, as was politically appropriate to their differing contexts. The ostensibly Janus-like nature of the exterior architecture of the east front also characterizes the interior of the hall. Whereas the structural design follows established medieval and early Tudor models, the decorative programme is Renaissance in spirit.

Its 'modern' embellishments include the ubiquitous square and cipher pattern which forms a narrow frieze encircling the hall on the wall plates and over the outer faces of the lower hammer beams. It also decorates the volutes of the pendants which are constructed to a very similar pattern as those of the landing vaults of the Roman stair (Fig.

6.19). Lion head masks also feature in both locations, as does the castle motif taken from the quarterings of the Cecil arms and implying ancestry from the ancient family of Caerleon, which is again reiterated in the stonework of the roofscape (Fig 6.19b)

Although the repertoire of Renaissance motifs used by Cecil at Burghley conforms to the standard design patterns being introduced at the fashionable end of the market in the 1570s, without exception where examples have survived, they are used very carefully to accentuate the architecture, never obscuring or overrunning the outlines of the forms but defining and interconnecting the larger scale programme. Rather than acting as applied decoration, surface embellishment is used as "explanatory articulation"⁵³ and provides visual reference points from part to part of the house.

The huge windows of the sixteenth century that would have made the hall far more "lightsome" than it appears today included the (now blocked) square-headed window in the south gable end behind its stone taffril. The outline of a reciprocal window of the same dimensions can be seen in the rubble stonework of the north gable of the hall, and investigation which I undertook when the interior of the hall was scaffolded revealed the interior mouldings of its stone jambs (Fig 6.20)⁵⁴ These windows, and possibly a central louvre, would have dramatically illuminated the roof and shown off the magnificent timbers and their decorative iconography, admired by Waldstein.⁵⁵ A similarly placed window in the great hall at Deene Park (c.1572) gives some impression of the effect those at Burghley would have created (Fig 3.2)

At ground-floor level Thorpe indicates that the screen was supported on four columns with engaged half columns at either end, all with square bases. These are consistent with the columns of the east loggia in the courtyard. Like the decorative programme, these would have provided a clear architectural resonance from part to part of the house. The panels and screen taken from Hatton's great house, now in the church at Holdenby indicate the style of screen one would expect at Burghley at this time, in

accordance with the roof carving and stone carving elsewhere in the house. However, as an integrated architectural feature, the screen itself may well have been a stone arcade more in the manner of Wollaton or Montacute,⁵⁶ in which case it would in turn have provided an introductory link to the magnificent Serlian-inspired chimneypiece which is the dominant feature of the main body of the hall below the roof (Fig 5.46b). This is on an appropriately heroic scale for its setting, reaching more than half way to the stone corbels from which the roof timbers spring, and is wholly in the classical Renaissance idiom, as discussed above. The simple design of the corbels themselves, meanwhile, is echoed in the carved decoration of the roof timbers.

The re-siting of the chapel may also have been part of the re-development plan for the east range at this time. In Cecil's households the traditional assembly of all members for formally conducted daily prayers in the chapel was maintained.⁵⁷ The chapel was an important part of both the private and the public life of his houses. At Burghley Thomas and Dorothy Cecil appear to have adopted a less ritualized regime, but this may have changed somewhat in June 1573 when Cecil's mother, Jane, moved back to Burghley from Stamford.⁵⁸ Her "chamber" at Burghley was almost finished in May.⁵⁹ Kemp wrote to Cecil that all was well "but for that there is not one that is in the ministry to do service there...that she may serve God twice a day" and suggested a priest from Cambridge should therefore be engaged as chaplain.⁶⁰ Jane's return to her former home, where technically she was still the mistress of the house, may have stimulated the development of the new chapel.⁶¹

In any event, the plan must have been to re-locate the chapel sooner or later to make way for the south stair. In the 1688 inventory the contents of the "Chapell Chamber" (where there was a chimneypiece), are listed after "the staircase pictures" which come at the end of the north range first-floor section, (i.e. the Roman stair). Then comes "My Lord's Clossett" followed by "the Chapell" and then "my Lord's Dark Bedchamber" and the "skreene clossett".⁶² Rooms 149 and 150 to the south of the present anti-chapel,

are still today known as the "Dark Nurseries." No windows could be sited on their east side because of the great hall. On Thorpe's plan T/110 must be where the stair from T/010 rose (giving access from below to the chapel) with a small room to the east backing onto the screens passage of the hall, which would accord with an identification as the "skreene clossett". A "chamber" and "the passage" listed in this area on the inventory agree with room T/150 and the corridor on its east side. By 1688 the chapel appears, therefore, to have been room T/148 which faces east/west and approximates to the present anti-chapel, while T/101 was the "Chapell Chamber" with chimneypiece, leading off the Roman Stair. In this position the chapel was conveniently sited in relation to both the private and the public areas of the sixteenth-century house.

On her visit of 1697 Celia Fiennes noted that "the Chapple is old and not to abide, the painting is good but the place is not suitable to any part else",⁶³ so it is reasonable to assume that the chapel in the inventory of 1688 was in its long-established position. At the beginning of the eighteenth century Peck noted the tradition in the house that a seat in the chapel was "still called Queen Elisabeth's Seat".⁶⁴ As in this case, such customs are seldom rooted in historical fact, but it still suggests a reference to a chapel that had not been recently fitted out. By the time Haynes drew his plan in 1755, the ground-floor rooms below the present chapel, not shown on Thorpe, were in place, from which one can infer that the room above, (the present chapel, 109), also existed. However, Walpole who visited in 1763 like Fiennes, described the chapel as "too low and not yet restored; some of the ornaments and in other parts of the house have been in good taste of the grotesque".⁶⁵ Possibly the present chapel room was added by the 5th Earl subsequent to Fiennes' visit, as intended, but as he died in 1700 it may not have been commissioned into use. The old, low-ceilinged chapel may have been retained until Brown's alterations after 1763, from when the present ceilings in the chapel and anti-chapel (which indeed is lower), date. "Grotesque" work would have been unusual decoration for a chapel, but this and its chapel chamber with chimneypiece replaced what was formerly Mildred Cecil's suite. T/148 is adjacent to the surviving wall painting with its arabesque "grotesque work: pattern

and it seems very possible the ornament which Walpole saw may similarly have survived from Mildred's smart accommodation of the earlier building phase.

If the great hall and great kitchen were added c.1572-1575, suitable access to the great chamber in the south range could quite conveniently have been organized in the short term by forming an opening through the west wall of the new hall at the dais end. This would have given access into the parlour and thence to the stairs (as conjectured in phase one) to the principal rooms on the first floor and could also have been a temporary route to the new chapel across the east lead walk above the courtyard loggia.⁶⁶ All the principal public rooms would have been in place, even if the connective tissue between them was a makeshift arrangement.

The West Range

As the west range was to retain its importance as the ceremonial state entrance from which the first impression of the house would be taken, it would have been the next logical priority in the sequence of the plan, after the hall range, and indications of its dates accord with the proposed sequence. Kemp's letter to Cecil asking for a plan of the new "face" of the buildings for the men to work to⁶⁷ was written on 17th September 1575 and the west range is the one area where the earlier range does appear to have been substantially demolished to be replaced by a newly planned range, immediately to the west of the old.

The date on the vault under the entrance arch suggests that the range was fairly advanced by 1577, and the new west entrance "face" is almost certainly the area to which Kemp was alluding.⁶⁸ Similarly, the terrace that we know fronted the west range is the most likely original position for the pair of gates which, as Richard Shute reported in 1578, had formerly "stood upon the Terrasse before the olde buyldinges" (Plan 12).⁶⁹

Cecil had visited Burghley in July 1575,⁷⁰ shortly after the queen's visit to Theobalds. The new building work at Burghley appears to reflect both his wide

experience of the queen's tastes and how best to cater for the corporate needs of the court. The work about to be started in 1575 was obviously going to be a fairly major undertaking in which the planning and the execution roles were split. Kemp in this instance was in charge of mustering the skilled labour force and he informed Cecil in the 17th September letter, that he was negotiating with "divers freemasons" for the job.⁷¹ With the amount of building going on in the area market forces obviously meant their services were at a premium, and Kemp found them as "subtell in their doings as any craftsmen in this land."⁷² By 1578 Richard Shute reported to Cecil that the weekly wage bill of the workmen was £11, calculated to be for about 50 men.⁷³ Shute had discharged the "superfluous nombre" and assessed that this would be sufficient labour to complete the work that Cecil had scheduled by Michaelmas, which is when Thomas Cecil reported the gallery should finally be finished.⁷⁴ Some structural work was being done in the garden but that on the house seems to have been confined to the west gallery range, upholding the premise that the building work was tackled sequentially, as one might expect in a house that was occupied for much of the time by Thomas and his family as well as by Cecil's mother.

On the east, courtyard side the design of the west range still had to be finely adjusted to the vagaries of the existing fabric. The only irregularity of the outward facing front, by contrast, is the difference between the south angle tower and the north in relation to the building as a whole. The north tower projects just over 3ft (1m) further forward of the north front than does the south tower relative to the south front. Again, this is a result of the western end of the courtyard, and therefore the west range, being off-set to the south. Otherwise, the built elevation to the west presents a confidently executed front that appears to have been carried out without compromise to a logically conceived paper plan, as Kemp's letter suggests was the situation.⁷⁵

There is some evidence of alterations to the existing stonework of the massive piers to either side of the entrance arch. Thorpe shows niches here which appear on Vanderbank's cartouche but were blocked by the time Haynes made his plan (Fig A.3 &

Plan F9). The original flanking arched openings draw the entrance nearer at eye-level to the classical triumphal arch motif. The expectation set up by the weighty, Roman base to the tower is, however, contradicted on the floors above. Ogee-typed, octagonal towers spring from first-floor level and flank three tiers of canted bay windows. As with the south front of the great hall, this formal entrance front and public face of the house is immediately located within a familiar native tradition of important buildings. It echoes those of numerous royal palaces, London gateways and the lodges of Cambridge colleges dating from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. At Kenilworth, Leicester had introduced a similar combination of triumphal arch with bay window above and flanking octagonal towers in the gate-house by 1575.⁷⁶

At Burghley this centralizing feature is not a separate, add-on element. It is bound together as an integral part of the front by the emphatic architraves that wrap over its whole surface. Equally, the mass of the masonry is balanced across the whole front by a huge amount of glass. At earlier houses, such as Layer Marney (1520s), where numerous windows are introduced on the tower, they appear to be punched into the solid brickwork rather than forming part of an integrated surface. At Coughton Court (c.1518-1535), on the other hand, glass takes over from wall on the central gate-tower to such an extent that the impression of surface movement dominates the architectural structure of the wall.⁷⁷ The plastic nature of the west front at Burghley prevents the architectural stability from being undermined by the glass. As Roger North was to observe, there were advantages to numerous recesses in a long gallery inside and out, "being projected according to art, and with all convenience below and above, for many purposes, not so consistent with a dead flat range."⁷⁸ The extent of the glass surfaces, however, is not as obvious as it becomes on the much smoother elevations of Hardwick for example, and the impression overall at Burghley is consequently far less estranged from its predecessors. Behind there are equally subtle but radical changes. The traditionally discreet gate-house interior is disposed of and the space instead is incorporated into the long gallery.⁷⁹ That would formerly have been its defensive angle towers are transformed into richly panelled closets.

Internally Cecil repeated the earlier west range disposition. The former lodgings were replaced by two new luxury suites, laid out virtually as a symmetrical pair, on either side of the entrance-way. They feature bay windows looking over the west forecourts, large fireplaces, access via the stair towers to the long gallery and state rooms on the first floor, direct access to the courtyard and, on the south side, to the principal gardens.⁸⁰ They would have provided ideal prestige accommodation for a number of important visitors at any one time, or for leading members of the court on a progress visit.

The first floor of the west range is similar in principle to the west gallery range in the proposed plan for "ye Inner Court" at Theobalds, drawn up for Cecil by Henry Hawthorn in 1572 (Plan 19). This shows a gallery with a central projection in its east and west walls and corner embrasures at either end on the west side. It is flanked by symmetrically matching suites of rooms, that can be by-passed by corridors leading into an enfilade of chambers to north and south. Like Burghley, the entrance range at Theobalds was built with a long gallery on the first floor over an open loggia facing into the courtyard, with stair towers leading from it at the angles. As Summerson proposes, Hawthorn was probably also responsible for two other plans which bear an even more striking resemblance to the first-floor gallery at Burghley as shown on Thorpe's plan. (Plans 27 & 28, cf. Plan F2).⁸¹

The surviving plans give a tangible idea of the sort of gallery designs Cecil was looking for in the early 1570s. Hawthorn was working for Cecil in 1575 when Kemp was awaiting the elevation drawing for Burghley, for he acted as go-between on Cecil's behalf to arrange the supply of stone for a banqueting house for the Earl of Leicester,⁸² and the following year was when Cecil instructed him to draw up the plans for Windsor, the castle of which Edward VI had complained "there be no galleries nor no garden to walk in".⁸³ The plans, the Clerk of the Works at Windsor requested, should be "perfecte plattes... such indeede as maie be perfecte for the wourkmen and maie afore hand be so thoroughly considered of, that there maie not be anie alteration after they are set up."⁸⁴ In

June of the following year Hawthorn also sent Cecil his "opinion in a lytle platt" for minor works at Windsor and at Hertford Castle.⁸⁵

"Perfecte plattes" that were comprehensive enough for craftsmen to build from, were exactly what Kemp was asking for in his letter in September 1575. Indeed, although the gallery and banqueting house at Windsor were not undertaken until 1582-4, by which time there is no trace of Hawthorn, they were executed largely in accord with one or other of the alternative designs, drawn to scale, which he had produced for the queen's approval.⁸⁶

Like the Theobalds plans, that for the first-floor gallery (now the royal library) at Windsor has a number of features that demonstrate a similarly original approach to spatial planning as that of the Burghley gallery plan. Hawthorn's Windsor plans (Plan 29)⁸⁷ also show a strong sense of the dramatic architectural possibilities presented by stairways, that were equally to be an important feature of Burghley.

The Windsor gallery plan shows a deep room recess with a canted bay window at the mid-point of the south wall, and another canted window features on the north side, although not symmetrically placed. The great bow window facing south-east is an original and effective response to the existing circumstances. Intended as a viewing stand for the proposed tennis court below, it is inserted into the circumference of the existing gate-tower, while the adjoining chamber over the gateway on the plan becomes another annexe of the gallery.⁸⁸ Off the western end, the well-lit stairway with two alternative flights to the floor below also makes imaginative use of what would otherwise be a rather mean space, while the plan of the stair below the gallery recess is similar in principle to the Roman stair at Burghley. So too is the internal stair leading to the banqueting house at the end of the terrace from the Little Park below. It is ingeniously positioned so that the angle of its central core is opposite the entrance to the banqueting house, thus creating a striking, but nevertheless symmetrical space, as the lobby entrance to the lantern-like banqueting house.

This could also be approached from the external stair which is itself not a standard feature but designed to form an angle at the eastern end of the terrace. These alternative plans for the work at Windsor are described by Summerson as "among the most interesting architectural drawings of the period".⁸⁹ They indicate a distinctive architectural imagination applied to developing coherent and inventive new designs even when existing fabric had to be taken into account, as was predominantly the case at Burghley.

The plan of the gallery at Burghley with its central belvedere balcony facing onto the courtyard, appears itself to be a very interesting new development of the long gallery plan despite the variety of gallery plans established in the royal palaces. The Queen's Long Gallery at Hampton Court (1533-37) for example, looked out over the park and, "with its great bay windows (two square sided, and a bow window in the centre) it was prophetic of many Elizabethan long galleries"⁹⁰ including that at Burghley. At Burghley, however, the gallery form developed further beyond that of a single spatial organisation.

The gallery ran the whole length of the range with a series of sub-spaces in the form of tower rooms, canted bay windows, and a combination of the two on the west front of the central gate-tower. There was little wall space for display on this side where there is a balanced sequence of west-facing windows, still disposed as on Thorpe's first-floor plan. The gallery measured c.132ft x 18ft (40.5m x 5.5m) and up to 28ft (8.5m) into the widest bay, so towards the upper end of the scale of gallery dimensions at the time.⁹¹ Thorpe shows two large chimneypieces with engaged column supporters, symmetrically placed on the east wall opposite the inside faces of the gate-tower bays. Between these are a pair of two-light windows that open onto the rear of the central balcony of the belvedere overlooking the courtyard. Flanking this central grouping, a matching pair of doorways lead into corresponding chambers giving access to the central balcony and with four-light windows also overlooking the courtyard.

The nearest approach to the arrangement within the main body of a gallery can be seen on the first-floor plan of Sir Thomas Heneage's Copthall (Fig 6.21a). Heneage was a member of the 'Cecil circle', and his family also came from Lincolnshire. He had sat for Stamford in the Parliament of 1553 and his local ties meant he may well have been in a position to keep up to date with the new developments at Burghley.⁹² Coope has suggested that the gallery at Copthall more probably dated from the 1570s-80s rather than c.1564 as has formerly been mooted.⁹³ Here the Chapel Gallery formed a subsidiary space leading off the main long gallery where a pair of entrance doors flanked the great chimneypiece, and were in turn flanked by bay windows to the north and south. The splendour of this arrangement is evident in Newdigate's drawing made in the late eighteenth century (Fig. 6.21b).⁹⁴

At Burghley, however, the subsidiary areas do not serve to link one area to another, they have become a self-contained development of the gallery itself. This ingenious, absolutely symmetrical arrangement creates a complex that is both inward and outward looking, where the spatial arrangement has become something much more sophisticated than an over-developed corridor.

Like Burghley by 1587-88, Hawthorn's plan for Theobalds has clearly defined symmetrical blocks forming pavilions at each of its four corners (Plan 19). The reconstruction of Theobalds based on Summerson's research shows the three-dimensional realisation of this basic plan looking from the south-west (Fig.6.22a). A lower central block over an outward-facing loggia is flanked by taller lateral bays that form massive corner pavilions that are repeated at the other two corners of the courtyard building. The fundamentals of the plan are similar to those of Burghley, and again, allowed covered access onto the roof walks as an integrated feature.⁹⁵ The south-east tower of this configuration which was to be the 'Conduit Court' block, pre-dated the other towers.⁹⁶ As at Burghley, therefore, there was a specific reason for organising the masses of the building in this way to create a three-dimensionally symmetrical building. But the end

result in both cases implies an architectural concept that went beyond practical expediency. In French examples of this plan the architectural emphasis of the pavilions is invariably created by their separate steeply raked roofs that rise above those of the corps de logis in between (Fig. 6.22b). The introduction of flattened lead roofs with balustrades, associated so strongly with later English Palladian architecture, was in fact introduced in England at houses like Burghley and Longleat, at an earlier date than in France.

Similarly, the positioning of both the principal staircases at Burghley, within angle pavilions that are nevertheless integrated into the main body of the symmetrically disposed building, draws upon French models, but does not merely ape a French planning pattern. Where the main stairs were absorbed into symmetrically disposed buildings in this way, rather than being "hors d'oeuvre" - an outside projection from the body of the building - the predominant trend in France was for stairs either in a central pavilion or assimilated within the corps de logis, as at Ecouen for example (Fig 6.23).⁹⁷ The particular requirements for the internal plan at Burghley, however, would have made a direct copy of this pattern impractical. The solution arrived at shows a considerable degree of architectural understanding and maturity in manipulating forms, that, while it may be inspired by foreign models, is modified to cater for specific circumstances. At the same time the necessity of assimilating these important features into the overall composition internally and externally is not overlooked. The architectural models have been comprehended intellectually rather than copied as if learned by rote.

Two earlier plans of the old house that came with the property at Theobalds have the same unusual convention of indicating the orientation of room dimensions by a short line over the Arabic numerals as Hawthorn uses on the "Inner Court" plan of Theobalds and the Windsor plans.⁹⁸ These earlier plans are also proposals for new work, rather than surveys, and must have been drawn up c.1564. Cecil was in contact with Hawthorn at the time for this is also the most likely date for Hawthorn's survey plan of Hertford Castle, annotated by Cecil to indicate where the temporary council chamber should be, and where

no doubt he was in charge of planning all the allocations which included that for the Court of Wards.⁹⁹

On the evidence available Hawthorn seems to be by far the strongest contender as Cecil's chosen candidate to draw up the plans for the new and innovative gallery range at Burghley, just as he did at Windsor and almost certainly at Theobalds. More importantly, if the overall plan of the development of Burghley was conceived from the beginning of Cecil's second building campaign, as appears likely, then Hawthorn was very possibly involved in providing "plattes" at planning stage of the concept of the whole building as he was with the major development of Theobalds in 1572.

If Hawthorn was already working privately for Cecil by 1564, and was also involved in the conceptual planning of Burghley, as he was in drawing up that for the Conduit Court at Theobalds, then his role in Cecil's architectural patronage is a significant one. But it is still Cecil who is addressed as though he were the principal "contriver and director" in the second phase of building at Burghley by Kemp, Richard Shute and Thomas Cecil.¹⁰⁰ His intimate knowledge of the buildings, implicit in the contents of much of the correspondence, particularly in the first building phase, confirms that this was more than conventional diplomatic flattery. But in Hawthorn he may well have found a like-minded and talented architect who could work up ideas into fully fledged plans as part of the collective creative process that is a constant of architecture, and especially the architecture of powerful personal patronage. At Burghley there are indications of a highly developed architectural mentality involved in the organisation of the internal plan and of the external structure, and in the relationship between the two. But the focus is very different from the architect's fascination for experimenting with spatial combinations and exhilaratingly abstract architectural effects for their own sake, that is clearly discernible from many of Robert Smythson's plans, and from the stairway and the external arrangement of Hardwick, for instance,¹⁰¹ or with the interest in outlandish plan shapes displayed in many of Thorpe's conceptual plans.

At Burghley the planning is focused on maximizing the potential of established forms for their particular human purpose. Dramatic effect is by no means ignored, but this tends to be allied to the potential for presentation of the individual to an audience and directed towards achieving a synthesis of social and ceremonial space, discussed in the following chapter. It suggests an intellect considering architectural aesthetics primarily in relation to human occupation, architecture completed by the human presence, rather than primarily as autonomous abstract form. This is where one might expect the architectural imagination of a patron and end user to be concentrated, and especially one of Cecil's political skill and experience.

As we have seen, Cecil was involved in policies to adopt new ideas in the field of military architecture, from where so many of the advances in building technology were emerging in the sixteenth century, and the new range at Burghley despite its derivation from traditional forms, was an ambitious structure. In the galleries that ran the whole length of the first and second floors there were no cross walls to strengthen the fabric and provide support for the prospect room located between the gate-house turrets on the roof above. This relied upon the octagonal turrets, springing only from first-floor level to act as buttresses.¹⁰² In fact considerable settlement of the north and south walls of this room has taken place, despite the insertion of cross walls beneath in the 5th Earl's remodelling of the interior of the house (Fig 6.24)¹⁰³ This was when both galleries were divided into bedrooms, subsequently referred to in the inventory of 1688 as the "Upper Gallery" and "Lower Gallery" rooms.¹⁰⁴

Other significant changes took place at the time of these alterations. The whole of the floor between ground and first floors was raised, which must have been effected before the galleries were divided. The difference in levels is evident from the oak panelling, which continues below the floor level in the first-floor closets in the south-west and north-west turrets of the central tower (124 & 127).¹⁰⁵ The panelling must, therefore, date from before 1672-75 when the work in the west range was undertaken for

the 5th Earl. Its architectonic Renaissance style is as one would expect of work being carried out for Cecil in the 1570s, even though a date of c.1578 would make this a fairly early example of architecturally organised wainscote.¹⁰⁶ The rosettes on the wide entrance pilasters are almost identical to those on the supporters of the hall chimneypiece, while the capstan-shaped cut-work decoration is an idiosyncrasy also found in the carved details of the great hall roof. (Fig 6.25 & 6.26).

The alteration of level indicated by the panelling in room 124 agrees with the present rise of 16ins (0.42m) at the junction of the north and west ranges. This is evident within the thickness of the wall at the western end of room 132 where there are steps between it and room 128 which are not shown by Thorpe. The height of the head of the stone vault of the west entrance (025) is 13ft 5ins (4.14m) whereas the closets to either side (024 & 027) beneath the panelled first-floor closets are 10ft 10ins (3.32m - allowing for a step of 14cms between). However, the ground-floor rooms of the north range beneath the original lower first-floor level are almost identical to the height of the west vault (025). Therefore, the void between the earlier first-floor level indicated by the panelling in 124 and the present ceiling level of 024 below, is sufficient to have accommodated the originally lower, first-floor level above the west vault (which remains at its sixteenth-century height).¹⁰⁷ Moreover, the ceiling height of the west range rooms to either side of the entrance vault (026 & 023) are 16ins (0.45m) higher than the ground floor rooms in the north range. Exactly the amount by which the floor was raised. Nor is this all. Having raised the ground-floor ceilings to a more magnificent level, those of the first-floor piano nobile had to be altered accordingly. The vyce leading downwards from the prospect room within the south-west turret of the central gate tower, terminates approximately 2ft 8ins (0.817m) below the present second floor, indicating its earlier level. As a result, the windows in the former upper gallery (now bedrooms) reach almost to the floor and are wholly uncharacteristic of sixteenth-century fenestration,¹⁰⁸ and the first-floor rooms below are again some 16ins (0.420m) taller than they must have been in the sixteenth century.

Above, at roof level, the prospect room formerly had windows on all four sides, evident from the stonework on the north and south walls where these are now blocked. On the east, courtyard, side the pair of windows are now dummies, masked internally by plaster infills. The large chimneypiece between the windows on the east wall, as well as the rising newel stair in the south-west turret giving access to the flat balustraded roof above appear to be part of the original sixteenth-century work, as does the reed-stiffened plaster floor mentioned above.¹⁰⁹

Cecil's surveyor, Richard Shute, reported to him on 30th July 1578 that externally the new buildings which contained the galleries were complete apart from details of the roof balustrading.¹¹⁰ If the west range including this grand fourth-storey chamber was accomplished by 1578, then it precedes Wollaton (begun 1580), Hardwick (1590-97) and the remodelling of Worksop (completed 1586), where height became an almost obsessive feature of the design.¹¹¹ It would have been contemporary with the development of the roofscape at Longleat where the existing two-storey gabled roofs with attics were being encased, and in some areas replaced by a third storey with the addition of balustraded lead roofs, in a similar manner as was taking place at Burghley.¹¹² There were turret "banqueting houses" at Longleat, but nothing in size and grandeur to rival this tower belvedere and balustraded roof-top platform above it. Leicester's soaring new range at Kenilworth where he entertained the queen so splendidly in 1575, would have been the most likely stimulant for Cecil to be attempting to rival or surpass.

At the end of July 1578 Richard Shute also informed Cecil that the "ffret of the gallerye very neare the half thereof is also done and the floore of the north ende is also shotte. The plasterwoorke is also doone everywhere to the gallery floore."¹¹³ Again it is unclear whether this refers to the floor or the ceiling, but as Shute was ordering large quantities of plaster the more private gallery on the second floor may have had a plaster floor like the prospect room and the earlier gallery at the east end of the house.

Six weeks after Shute's report, Thomas Cecil wrote to his father on 11th September.¹¹⁴ William Cecil had not been able to obtain leave from the queen to quit the court and visit Burghley himself, and had, therefore, sent written instructions to which Thomas was obviously replying. The gallery would be finished by Michaelmas, Thomas informed him, though the fretwork was proving time-consuming and expensive, implying that an elaborate plaster ceiling, like that surviving in the bay of the south "Hell" staircase (014) was going up. William Cecil had been in doubt as to whether to "ceil" it or "hang" the gallery when they had met recently in Norfolk. Thomas was in favour of "ceiling it with a fair ceiling". By this it is clear that he meant the decorative work on the walls, and almost certainly timber panelling, as the surviving work in the closet would suggest, and to which the word "ceiling" invariably referred.¹¹⁵ Hangings, in other words tapestries, Thomas argued, would be even more expensive, and not suitable "at all times that a man would have use of a gallery", which suggests perhaps he had in mind some more strenuous "pastime" than "the gentle moving within the walls of an house" that Roger North thought seemly for a long gallery.¹¹⁶ Besides, Thomas continues, "the place itself is subject to much sun and air, which will quickly make them fade". This was a problem posed by all the new houses with vastly increased window surface, though as Francis Bacon pointed out, bay windows, in the manner of all the larger gallery windows at Burghley, were not only "pretty retiring places", they kept "both the wind and the sun off".¹¹⁷ However, Thomas continued, if his father was intent on buying hangings, these could in any case be hung over the "ceiling" on special occasions. One has the impression that the work was already committed by Thomas, and that he was hoping to get his father's agreement to it before he realized it was already fait accompli.

Thomas also reported that Sir Walter Mildmay had been to dinner and "greatly liked the new building, and the rooms, but especially the gallery, in respect of the proportion of it."¹¹⁸ Roger Manners was also exceedingly impressed, or so he wrote to Cecil on 27th September: "I think your lordship will very well like your building at Burghley. I can

praise it no further than to say it is in very truth the best builded and fairest that ever I saw anywhere."¹¹⁹

The west range was virtually completed by the Autumn of 1578, while the north and final range was not finished until 1587-88. It seems reasonable to assume that the development of the south range came between the two. This would have completed the politically important areas of the house reserved for "feasts and triumphs"¹²⁰ before work on the more private domestic north side of the house was undertaken.

The South Range

If the sequence of building is fundamentally as has been argued here then, for a period, there must have been very awkward temporary junctions between the new three-storey west range and the pitched roofs of the north and south ranges as conjectured. A proper coupling could not have been attempted until the walls were raised on these ranges. Peculiarities in the building in these areas on the north and south fronts support the theory that the west range was completed before the lateral ranges were remodelled. On the south front, what was previously thought to be a distortion in the lower part of the wall caused by movement and settlement of the fabric subsequent to its construction, can in fact be identified on the RCHME plan as a slight change of direction in the building line itself (Plan 3d marked D).¹²¹ This would be explained by slight differences in the wall line of the south face of the new west range, and that of the existing south range that had to be reconciled when they were finally joined, as happened at the junction between the hall wall and the tower at the eastern end of the south range. Similarly, above the architrave between first-floor and second-floor level, where the south range wall would have been new work, the fault in the wall line is imperceptible. The defect in the wall line occurs directly above the west terminating wall of the south cellar, again supporting this as the original western-most limit of the earlier south range. There is evidence of a break in the stonework at all three levels at this junction of the south and west ranges, as one might expect where the two fabrics were finally joined together (Fig 6.27). Furthermore, the

architrave between first and second floors is not level at this point, but declines from east to west, again implying a slight mismatch at the linkage point of the building below the level of a new upper walled storey.

Behind the south-facing loggia Thorpe shows a row of partitioned rooms, each about 16ft x 13ft, (c.5m x 4m) that lead one from another. Their large windows face onto the courtyard and the only access directly into the house is from a passage by the south-west stair tower. The plan again is unusual. The area could, however, have provided vital flexible space as either accommodation or extra service areas during a progress visit. As the schedules for the visits of the queen to Theobalds demonstrate, even though the house was planned and extended to house the court, every inch of space had to be pressed into service to accommodate the huge numbers.¹²²

The major internal development of the range was the great stair chamber at the east end with its straight double flights of seventeen risers in all, separated by a half-landing in the centre. As Palladio advised, important stairs should have an odd number of treads and ideally no more than eleven risers without a pause, to keep one on the right foot as "the ancients observed", and to avoid undignified exertion.¹²³ Together with the Roman stair in the north range, the two stairs were positioned as Francesco di Giorgio advocated, "da man destra e man sinistra" of the house.¹²⁴ As Howard points out, "the idea of the staircase in a splendidly decorated room to itself was not a feature of even the grandest houses of the nobility in the first half of the sixteenth century."¹²⁵ Even by the 1570s staircases in England set in such a lavish space (approximately 40ft by 25ft (12.1m x 7.6m) at first-floor level) were extremely unusual. That at Holdenby which Cecil admired in 1579 was of a similar size, according to Thorpe's plan of the house.¹²⁶ The plan indicates an arrangement more like the great dog-leg timber staircase at Theobalds that may indeed have preceded the one at Holdenby, while the Burghley stair appears to have no direct precedent in English architecture.¹²⁷ The most likely explanation for this expansive setting, suggested by the conjectural plan of the earlier house, is that existing

reception rooms, the parlours below and the chapel above, were boldly and imaginatively converted. The great stair constructed in a former courtyard at Althorp (begun 1666, Fig 6.29a) gives some idea of the arrangement of the Burghley stair, although the Burghley stair had solid side walls, like that shown in Fig. 6.29b.

T/050, leading off the stair chamber, looks to be the most obvious relocation for the parlour. No fireplace is shown, but on this "public" side of the house, the parlour may no longer have been a particularly important room. T/050 is shown as on the same level as the new great hall, as would be expected for a room converted from part of the old great hall. The floor level of the rooms above it (T/150 & 149), is higher than the surrounding areas have suggesting a higher floor level and concomitant higher ceiling level below.¹²⁸

Returning to the stair chamber, it appears from the truncated pattern of the surviving plasterwork ceiling at the present mezzanine level in the south-east tower bay of 014, (T/014 / T/114) that this ceiling originally extended into the main body of the stair chamber (Fig. 6.30). The nature of its overall pattern can be gauged from a later sketch design by Henry Mitchell which derives from it (Fig. 6.31a).¹²⁹ The ribs have no surface decoration and are similar in profile to those of the stone vaults in the west entrance and the landing vaults on the Roman stair, both compatible with a date of the late 1570s or early 1580s. There are a number of examples of plaster ceilings in England with which it can be compared. The hall at Trerice in Cornwall for instance and the great chamber at Gilling Castle in Yorkshire both have broadly similar ceilings thought to date from the 1570s.¹³⁰ The Charterhouse great chamber, decorated for Thomas Howard, 4th Duke of Norfolk, between 1565-72, has similar narrow ribs and is an early example of a high-quality plaster ceiling in England (Fig. 6.31b)¹³¹

The two surviving pendants are extremely well modelled, high quality work and based on the classical acanthus-leaf motif that is also found on the hall chimneypiece.¹³² One of the pendants terminates in four outward facing mask-heads, which are similar in

spirit to the classical masks featured on the hall roof, and again this accords with the consistency of style in the decorative features found throughout the house in the surviving sixteenth-century work. As with stonework, woodworkers practice was often taken up by plasterers as the vogue for use of the lighter and cheaper materials grew during the sixteenth century. However, like the plaster fretwork Thomas Cecil referred to in the west gallery in 1578, work of this quality would probably have been "lingering and costly".¹³³ The quality of the work is nevertheless at odds with the clumsiness with which the design relates to the space so that one of the pendants overlaps the surrounding cornice, and again suggests that the executors may have been working to designs supplied from London and calculated from paper plans that were not quite accurate to the building itself.

If the plaster ceiling in the tower bay of the stair chamber originally extended into the main body of the room, it must represent the original first-floor ceiling height in the stair chamber and implies a second floor above. The ceiling height of the ground floor of the south range, meanwhile, was almost certainly raised towards the end of the seventeenth century at the same time as that in the west range. There is no change of level between the floors at the junction of these ranges (between 118 & 121) and the existing floors in the south range are not original at first-floor level.¹³⁴ They must have been installed when the room divisions were altered by the 5th Earl of Exeter, prior to Verrio's work, and prior to the drawing up of the inventory by Culpepper Tanner in 1688.¹³⁵ The ceiling height in the south range in 016 is 14ft 10ins (4.58m), just higher than the raised height west range ground-floor rooms. As the south rooms were formerly the loggia and the partitioned rooms behind, it seems unlikely they would have had higher ceilings in the sixteenth century than the more important lodging chambers on the ground floor of the west range. The proposition is further born out by Haynes' survey plan which shows 21 stairs in two flights of 10 and 11 on the south stair (which is placed as in Thorpe), compared with Thorpe's 17. By contrast, on the Roman stair where the floor was not raised and the steps must have been shallower, they both show the same number of risers to the first floor, in flights of 10, 4 and 10.¹³⁶

North makes a number of references in his treatise to the general lowness of rooms in old houses which he regarded as one of their few drawbacks. When he mentions Burghley however, he contrasts it with Windsor which "had bin much better, if the east part of the court had bin new built.... Burghleigh House neer Stamford is an instance of this, so also the Duke of Beafort's at Badminton." The only fault of Badminton is that "some of the chief rooms are tinted with lowness in pitch, occasioned by the old ordinance taken", implying that this was not the case at Burghley.¹³⁷

If the floor has been raised by c.16ins (446mm), this would mean the first-floor ceiling height in this stair chamber was originally between 14ft and 15ft, which is as one might expect in grand public rooms of the sixteenth century. Ceiling heights appear to have varied at Theobalds, but in the important chambers *facing the great garden for instance*, surviving fragments indicate that these were approximately 15ft.¹³⁸ The plaster ceiling which is c.16ins (446mm) above the head of the window in the bay is consistent with the expectations set up by the exterior architrave mouldings and so would have also been consistent with the original floor/ceiling levels one would expect elsewhere in the house and which are retained in the north range.

The broad staircase as shown by Thorpe had an open well cutting through the ground floor, forming a double-height area in the centre of the volume of space, with walls on either side to support it, leading up to an open galleried landing (see Fig 6.29). It must have been on these walls that Baron Waldstein noted "the names and coats-of-arms of some of the Garter Knights" that he saw on the stairs on his visit in July 1600.¹³⁹

Haynes' plan of 1755 agrees with Thorpe's ground-floor plan in the position of the stairs. On the ground floor Thorpe shows a doorway to the right of the foot of the stair, and an opening on the left. No stairs leading downwards at this point are indicated leaving a change of level of some 5ft (1.6m) unaccounted for between the great hall level and that

of the courtyard and south range with which it is shown to be contiguous. The same situation occurs on Haynes' plan, but the area is described thus: "Towards the South end and West side of the Old Hall turn upon a Staircase which goes over the Allsatia the ceiling painted by Verrio the Description of Hell as represented by the poets."¹⁴⁰ As the stair downwards is missing in both instances, and Haynes plan was also a commissioned survey and is generally accurate, one can infer that it must have been sited under the rising central stairway. As Palladio suggests, this is an area which in good planning should be put to some useful purpose.¹⁴¹

Ahead as the stair was climbed, Thorpe shows an elaborate portal screen running across the whole width of the first-floor west wall - now replaced with painted scenes contained within fictive architecture, dating from the nineteenth century. It was supported on four engaged columns with a semi-circular, columned projection in the centre. Again this reiterates the architectural theme of the hall screen, and must have made a spectacular opening into what was the first of a series of "ample, beautiful adorned places".¹⁴²

Palladio, who recommends that stairs should lead onto such magnificent spaces, also advocated that "it would please me much, if it was in a place where that before one comes to it the most beautiful part of the house was seen ..but however let it be manifest and easily found."¹⁴³ There should, he adds be good light "evenly spread" and the treads should be at least four foot wide and twice as long as they are high. Even if Cecil and his designer were not familiar with Palladio's specification, set between the great hall and the huge first-floor chamber which measured over 50ft (17m) in length, they could hardly have adhered to his desired brief more closely.

The value that Cecil attached to ceremonial stairways is evident from his letter to Hatton written after visiting the unfinished Holdenby in 1579 .¹⁴⁴ As recent studies have shown, stairs were an important feature in the ceremonial rituals of the sixteenth century

throughout Europe.¹⁴⁵ The stairs of the ducal palace in Venice for example "were specifically designed to accommodate courtly ritual and diplomacy... Already in the Medieval period staircases were integrated into political life in Venice".¹⁴⁶ As a result of their high status, staircases constitute some of the most interesting, inventive and spectacular examples of architecture throughout Europe in the period. As Thurley has demonstrated, their status was no less significant in palace architecture in England, particularly in Henry VIII's later building works.¹⁴⁷ The south stair at Burghley does not, however, follow the trend in royal properties towards the end of his reign, whereby stairs leading straight from the exterior to the royal suites were designed to by-pass the great hall, if indeed there was a great hall.¹⁴⁸ It is in the conventional position, leading from the dais end of the great hall, which itself becomes part of the splendid, formal, public approach to what would have been the *presence or audience chamber during royal occupation*.

This and the other chambers on the first floor of the south range, as shown by Thorpe were rearranged into what are known as the 'George Rooms' for the 5th Earl and decorated with coved ceilings painted by Antonio Verrio.¹⁴⁹ They rise through two storeys with the exception of the "First George Room" (119) which was part of the former long gallery, where there is a second floor above. The upper windows on the south front up to this point are all dummies. The extreme height of these rooms, which are 24 ft (7.3m) to the underside of the Verrio painting even with the present almost certainly raised floor level, would have been loftier even than the "High Great Chamber" at Hardwick, and would be surprising anywhere other than a great hall of an Elizabethan house, even one of the grandest pretensions.¹⁵⁰ The same would be true of a row of clerestory windows above the principal windows,¹⁵¹ but the surviving wall-painting decorating the splays of one of the now dummy windows above the Verrio ceilings (W/215/4) confirms that these were exposed, and that there was quite smart decoration at this level (Fig. 3.9).¹⁵² There are two tiers of windows in the later great halls at Hatfield and Audley End, for instance, but not in any of the other rooms of state.¹⁵³ Another surviving fragment of a

decorative frieze painting on the second floor of the west range at Burghley (behind panelling on the west wall of 228)) indicates that the upper gallery had similarly good quality, painted decoration, in this case of an intriguing trompe l'oeil architectural design (Fig. 6.32). It would seem far more likely that these higher windows above the painted ceilings originally lit a second floor of Cecil's remodelled range, as they still do at the west end of the range and that the floor between the second and third storeys was removed in preparation for Verrio's work when the other major structural alterations to the interior were carried out.

A suite of well-appointed second-floor accommodation above the state rooms and adjoining a gallery would not be unusual for a great house in the 1570s. At Chatsworth, the Shrewsburys were adding a complete upper tier of second-floor state rooms in the 1570s-80s,¹⁵⁴ while at Theobalds the accommodation schedule for 1583 makes it clear that the personal apartments designated for the queen and her retinue were on the "third stage" of the inner court, with an upper gallery adjacent. Cecil's own suite during visits was also on the second floor, as was "a gallerie named the Suitors gallerie."¹⁵⁵

One further fragment of painting survives behind the panelling immediately above the bay window in the 'Fourth George' room (W/116/1, Fig 6.33a). The quality of this painting is more refined than the surviving fragment in the upper window embrasure (W/215/4) though their designs are similarly based on a pattern of arabesques and no doubt derive from fairly standard pattern book formats.¹⁵⁶ The lower painting closely resembles the inlaid pitch decoration on the hall panelling of the 1570s at Deene Park. It appears to be part of a frieze that again one would expect to have decorated the upper section of the wall just below the ceiling, with tapestries or panelling below.

The balance of evidence strongly suggests an upper storey in the south range which would have had floor to ceiling levels equivalent to the existing rooms in the north range where neither the floor nor the ceiling levels appear to have been altered since the

sixteenth century, and which still allow for an adequately impressive piano nobile on the first floor. The only exception is the north is the double-height 'Bow Room' (134) which is 27ft high (8.23m), and although radical innovations were introduced in this range, it is reasonable to assume this also had a floor above in the sixteenth century.

Externally the south front had been remodelled, as discussed above, by the time Vanderbank's tapestries were made (before 1688).¹⁵⁷ The stone sheathing of the wall to either side of the central pavilion half obscured the first floor windows on its side elevation as shown by Thorpe (W/T115/3 & W/T116/2) as is evident from the stonework surrounding these now blocked apertures (Fig.6.28b). Surviving interior jambs of what was W/T116/2 were discovered during maintenance work in the 1980s and confirmed that the north side of the window would have been blocked by the new wall face.¹⁵⁸ The sixteenth-century stone mullioned windows may have been re-used on the upper floor of the new sheathing wall, but the original leaded-light glazing, evident from glazing bar holes of these now dummy windows, was replaced in the nineteenth century by wrought iron windows in the upper lights and timber ones in the lower. The present sash windows inserted into the stone mullion frames on the first floor, meanwhile, are similarly believed to be nineteenth century.¹⁵⁹

On the ground floor the three-bay open loggias shown by Thorpe were also replaced under the 5th Earl's direction by six-arched glazed bays, and the double bay of the pavilion by a central arched feature with subsidiary arches on either side. On the outer lateral bays the ground-floor windows were replaced by taller stone-framed windows that extend below the line of the plinth. The work was executed by John Thompson, the fashionable London mason, between 1682-1687.¹⁶⁰ Thorpe shows the first-floor windows of the pavilion running continuously across the bay with a slender partition wall across the width of the range from the central mullion, dividing T/115 from T/116. The existing windows in the bay (W/116/1 & 2) are the only first-floor windows on the south front with ovolo, as opposed to sunk chamfer, mullion and transom profiles. This

discrepancy suggests they may be of a different date and, possibly, that they survive from the sixteenth century, but if so, they are considerably narrower than as shown on Thorpe's plan.

The south front now looks very different from how it must have appeared towards the end of the sixteenth century, but by the time Cecil's redevelopment of the south range was completed the public area of the house had been transformed into a minor palace, with all the fundamentals necessary for playing host to monarch and court in place, and on a scale fitting to the status of both the monarch and her most powerful subject. Cecil might find it useful to hide behind his mother's skirt's when challenged about its magnificence, just as he hid behind the queen's with regard to Theobalds,¹⁶¹ but Burghley House, despite the decorous dues it paid to its local environment, was made in the image of Lord Burghley, Lord Treasurer of England, leading European statesman, far more than of William Cecil, son of Jane Heckington of Bourne.

The North Range

The advancement of the more privately oriented north range completed the corpus of Cecil's house. It is here that the problems for the symmetrically organized architectural programme caused by inherent in the irregularities of the building manifest themselves most obviously. As well as the disparate positions of the level changes between the higher and lower bays at roof level, the difficulties that must have been encountered when the north range was joined to the west are far more apparent than on the south front. The architrave between first and second floors declines to such an extent from east to west in order to meet with that of the north-west tower that the western-most first floor window (W/130/2) has had to be made one pane shorter than its neighbours to the east. As on the south, things are more regular at second-floor level and the architrave above is parallel with the roof line (Fig. 6.28a). On his elevation of the north front

Brown proposed ironing out this all too obvious faux pas but the work was never carried out (Fig. A.8)

The disarray can, in part, be accounted for by its being the last front of the ambitious plan to be completed; there was nowhere else to go to cover up the mismatches between the parts. None of Burghley's eight fronts was treated as a 'back end' by Cecil. However, there is also a singular lack of ingenuity in disguising the architectural discrepancies relative to that shown elsewhere in the building where effort to deceive the eye from detecting far less obvious irregularities has been made. This suggests there may have been a certain loss of executive control. By the mid-1580s Cecil was pre-occupied with affairs of state centred on the build up to the trial of Mary Queen of Scots and, following her subsequent execution in February 1586/7, his relations with the queen over the whole affair were at their most strained of the entire period of his office, and came the closest to breaking down altogether. He stayed part of the time at Burghley during the trial, held only a few miles away at Fotheringhay, but in the immediate future the prospect of a royal visit to Northamptonshire, scene of an event that Queen Elizabeth wanted to wipe completely from her consciousness as well as from her conscience, was remote.

Change in management may also partially account for the botching on the north front. Peter Kemp, Cecil's faithful steward and agent at Burghley since the early 1560s, died in 1578.¹⁶² Henry Hawthorn is unrecorded after 1577 and may also have died.¹⁶³ The loss of these men may have been the occasion for the plan (now lost) enclosed with Thomas Fowler's letter to Cecil of 29 September 1578 and endorsed in a contemporary hand "Symonds Platt for Burghley hall".¹⁶⁴ At this late date, as argued above, is unlikely to have been a design plan for the hall, and more probably was a survey or detail of some sort, possibly to give guidance to Richard Shute, who took over from Kemp at Burghley. Symonds, who became surveyor of Cecil's London properties, was eminently capable of undertaking such a task, whereas in contrast to Hawthorn, there is little evidence of more creative talent.¹⁶⁵

Richard Shute, Kemp's successor, was himself certainly better qualified as a surveyor than his predecessor, as his map of Cliffe Park, drawn up in 1593 and preserved at Burghley, demonstrates.¹⁶⁶ He was also of sufficient consequence to have sat in Parliament for Stamford in 1593. But he appears to have been a far less reliable overseer than Kemp. From the beginning of his career at Burghley he was repeatedly involved in litigation, mostly concerning disputes over property.¹⁶⁷ A paper drawn up in 1595 gives details of his misappropriation of timber, stone and lead belonging to Cecil, which he had used to build a house in Stamford.¹⁶⁸ Two years later he ceased being employed by Cecil, who seems to have withdrawn his patronage of Shute altogether.¹⁶⁹ Under such stewardship it is easy to see how standards of building practice at Burghley may have dropped.

At the same time, however, certain radical features, the final flourishes of the plan, were introduced in the north range. Here the constraints imposed in the parade route of the house in order to cater for the essentially traditional ceremonial and processional rituals of the court, were absent. While interesting and inventive architectural ideas like the developments of the long gallery and the south stairway were implanted into the public areas of the house in the second building phase, they were essentially extensions of the possibilities allowable within the remit of established forms.

A number of similarities are evident between the architecture of the north range and Thomas Cecil's building works at Wimbledon, which bore the date 1588 over the entrance-way so must have been started at about the time that this range was being completed. Certain comparisons can also be made with his later building at Wothorpe, designed as the more intimate retiring lodge from the great house of Burghley. Thomas may have been taking his lead from Cecil's developments at Burghley - he certainly framed his references to it in his correspondence with his father in 1587 as "Your Lordship's buildings." He hoped Cecil could "get leave to see the perfection of your long and costly buildings,

wherein your posterity I hope will be thankful unto your lordship for it, as myself must think myself most bound who of all others receiveth the most use of it."¹⁷⁰ Cecil was still holding the purse strings, as he had been when Shute reported to him about wages for the men in 1578.¹⁷¹ Nevertheless, as Thomas was on site much of the time, the area occupied by his own family, rather than that planned with Cecil's political entertaining in mind, is where one might most expect indications of his influence to surface.

The inference that this range was, as recommended by Bacon, a separate "side for household" and for "dwelling", distinguished from those reserved for "feasts and triumphs",¹⁷² is drawn most convincingly from the position of the north frontispiece and the Roman stair. The whole impact of the fully developed architecture of the main courtyard was designed for an entry made from the west on an axis with the clock-tower frontispiece. The north frontispiece, though a spectacular feature, makes little sense as a formal approach to the courtyard (Fig 6.1a). The hall into which it opens lies on a direct axis behind it (T/034), but, because the frontispiece does not align with the courtyard pavilion on the opposite side of the range, in order to achieve a symmetrical opening to the house from the north, the west wall of T/034 was constructed so as to dissect the window under the courtyard pavilion (W/T033/4). The off-set doorway at the rear of the entrance hall opening into the courtyard would seem to be very unlikely as the intended primary route to be followed from this approach.

The frontispiece and hall behind it do, however, make a great deal of sense as a fittingly splendid introduction for the private visitor to the "principal" seat of a great family. Turning to the east from the hall, where Thorpe shows a generous opening, there is direct passage through a large reception room to the Roman stair (T036). This allows a suitably impressive route to the grand-scale chambers on the first floor of the north range (T135 etc.) and also to the chapel (T148) - via the chapel chamber to the east of the stair (T101) - as well as upwards to the second-floor accommodation and roof walks.

The French-inspired architecture of the stair has been likened to the upper flights of that of the Hôtel de Ville in Paris. These were probably added to the Hôtel c.1550 and similarly had barrel vaults over the flights decorated with the square and cipher motif, although on a much larger scale than at Burghley (Fig.6.35).¹⁷³ Guillaume describes the Parisian vaults as "décorées de caissons 'antiques' - les premiers du genre en France."¹⁷⁴ There are no known prints dating from the sixteenth century that illustrate this stair. However, Thomas Cecil would have had plenty of opportunity to see it when in Paris in the 1560s. As has been suggested elsewhere, the Venetian ambassador to Paris may have proposed the idea for the Scala d'Oro in the Doge's Palace, having seen that constructed for Henry II in the Louvre in 1547.¹⁷⁵ In the same manner Thomas could have suggested a design inspired by a French model. There are numbers of stairs of similar form in France including at Ecouen, (though minus the vault decoration - Fig 6.23).¹⁷⁶ There are however, no known examples in England before Burghley.

The decoration of the barrel vaults is consistent throughout, apart from individual treatment of the lion-head masks above the landing keystones, and some variation in the motifs within the circles of the pattern which consist in the main of heraldic symbols appertaining to the Cecils, twenty two of which are the crescent moons of Thomas's mother's family.¹⁷⁷ The rib vaults with pendants over the landings, meanwhile, are once more a feature very similar to an illustrated description in de l'Orme's Nouvelles Inventions (Fig.6.35).¹⁷⁸

The Cecilian imagery on the vaults may have been painted and would have been more distinctive when illuminated from the pair of double height windows, shown by Vanderbank and Haynes, giving onto the stair on the north front. As this front was designed to be symmetrical about the new frontispiece, one might expect them to be echoed by matching great windows on the western side, where Thorpe shows a similar pair of windows at ground-floor and first-floor levels (W/T/032/1 & 2 and W/T/132/1 & 2) but there is no evidence to suggest they represent similar great windows.¹⁷⁹ This was also to

occur at Thomas Cecil's house at Wimbledon where a similar double-height window appears only on one side of its otherwise symmetrical entrance front. The probability is for the same anomaly at Burghley, and may even have been an intentional signal of the presence of a great stair.¹⁸⁰

According to the 1688 inventory the rooms to which the Roman stairs gave access on the first floor would have provided a complete modern suite of "private" state accommodation¹⁸¹ and could also have catered for meetings of the Privy Council which continued during progress visits. Their disposition appears to be similar to that shown by Thorpe and there is no reason to suppose that their functions had altered very significantly by 1688 when the inventory was made and the "North Dining Roome" (T/134) was hung with twenty "Old Pictures" including one of "Lord Tresurer Burghley", suggesting that the room had not been modernized and retained its original fixtures as well as function until it was completely remodelled and painted by Louis Laguerre, starting in 1697.¹⁸²

On the ground floor, turning west out of the hall, meanwhile, there is a suite of good sized living accommodation, extending if necessary into the west range, with access via the corridor (T046) to the north-west stair tower and the first and second floors. The whole area could have been serviced by the great kitchen, or more probably, by a privy kitchen in one of the many service rooms surrounding it. The private area of the house, developed from where Mildred and William Cecil had their accommodation, has in effect become a compact U-shaped range. At the west end it can take in the galleries and the well-appointed living accommodation below. At the east end the large rooms beyond the chapel to the south would also provide extra accommodation. This would be a possible location for Cecil's mother's suite, adjacent to the chapel, but slightly removed from the main family quarters.

The north frontispiece is itself a radical departure from the conventional porch feature even of the most advanced sixteenth-century architecture in England. The

traditional medieval form might be replaced by a Renaissance tower frontispiece forming a central pavilion, as in the courtyard, but it was still habitually a square-planned projection from the main body of the building, like its native predecessor. On the ground floor the entrance arch was an open loggia, similar in plan to the south front central pavilion. The hall into which it led does not replace the great hall on the public side of the house.

However, hall and frontispiece combined signalled a very interesting new development in domestic planning. The hall was without doubt conceived as an important reception point in its own right, and had in fact become an entrance hall. Furthermore, it was oriented laterally across the central section of the range. The familiar progression through porch and screens passage to the body of the hall had been advanced, *so that the elaborate frontispiece* stood in place of the two former components, and opened straight into the hall.

As Gotch noted, although the hall at Wothorpe was not placed laterally, its plan is of interest "for it is an early example of the great hall being intended rather as an entrance than as the principal dwelling room."¹⁸³ Other examples of these less formal buildings, such as the banqueting house at Holdenby (before 1587) and the Lodge at Worksop, are amongst the earliest known examples of domestic buildings with lateral halls in England,¹⁸⁴ although this was a standard plan in French domestic architecture.¹⁸⁵ Again, it is not surprising to find these signs of movement away from well-established traditions in English patterns of living, appearing first outside the formal framework of the great house.

Unlike Wothorpe, the separation of the private family quarters at Burghley was not a wholesale removal to a satellite building of the main house. The north range of Burghley, as interpreted, could, nevertheless, have functioned perfectly well in the everyday life of the household as fitting accommodation on a manageable scale for Thomas Cecil and his family. Meanwhile, the "public" part of the house could largely have been shut down without inconvenience. The approach from the north maintained the impression of a great house even when the main body of the building was out of commission, and the expansive

traditional features of porch, screens passage and hall were condensed into a sharper and more compact form.

While the family quarters might become more convenient and private, a huge body of servants was still needed to maintain them. But at Burghley, as was to happen at Wothorpe, they were now to be housed under separate roofs. The matching pair of two-storey service or lodging ranges which projected northwards from the angle towers of the north range were almost certainly added at this time (Fig 6.36). The new ranges defined the limits of the main block of the symmetrically organised courtyard house, cutting it off to the north-east from the north face of the kitchen with its great chimney buttress. But because they were lower than the principal floor of the main house, they did not interrupt the view northwards over the Welland valley. They also served to separate this private family side of the house from the more public spaces, and gave the added gravitas of a forecourt introduction to the approach from the north. Thomas Thorpe's map of the estate of 1623 shows a track leading from the Barnack Road straight to this north side of the house mid-way between the service ranges, which would have been the most obvious axial approach through the park to this side of the house (Plan 24). According to his brother John's plan, the splendid frontispiece was flanked by terraces with balustraded fronts divided by square section stone pedestals (as shown by Vanderbank Fig.A.2), similar to the existing balustrade on the roof above which they may have matched. Almost identical features to the obelisks with inward facing scrolls to either side which feature on the cresting, flank the chimneystack and the courtyard clockface can be seen on the skyline of the range Hatton added at Kirby (Figs. 5.15b & 6.13).

The new ranges provided a considerable amount of extra accommodation space and potential offices convenient for the kitchen, possibly to compensate for the loss of a service court to the north-east of the house.¹⁸⁶ In 1756 Capability Brown proposed developing the north-west range into a library wing, but this was not taken up by the 9th Earl, and the range was demolished.¹⁸⁷ The surviving range shares the finer architrave

profiles of the frontispiece and upper storey of the central section of the north front of c.1587 which are nearer to the outlines of the courtyard architraves than the otherwise more robust profiles of those of the outward facing fronts.

As is evident from its west front, this range has been much altered. The ground-floor level has been changed and basement windows added to what is now a large storage area. Former doorways have been blocked, and the rubble stone walls are exposed. These would most probably have been stuccoed in the sixteenth century, with only the fine stone dressings which define the architectural features exposed.¹⁸⁸ The now blocked stone archway at the northern end of the range is very similar to one at right-angles to it on the eastern side, and both are wide enough to give access for coaches, which were becoming fashionable by the 1580s, suggesting that there may have been a stable block built here at the same time as the north ranges.¹⁸⁹

The arrangement on the south-west side at Wothorpe followed the same pattern as the north forecourt at Burghley, as can be seen in Haynes' view (Fig.6.37). Although the flanking ranges have ridge roofs, there are other similarities in the detail of the architecture with those at Burghley. The octagonal turrets of the main body of the house at Wothorpe have the same distinctive pyramidal spurs at the four corners of the square towers from which they rise. They also have the same blind roundels on the entablature below their stone types, while the roundel windows on the west face of the surviving range at Burghley become oeils-de-boeuf at Wothorpe. The entrance frontispiece, however is of the tower type and does not take up the more sophisticated form introduced at Burghley.

The plan of Wothorpe as a whole, however, is an amalgamation of a square with a Greek cross plan intersecting it. That of the frontispiece at Burghley is based on the same principle (dissected), of interlocking square and circular forms, the amalgamation of the two ideal geometrical forms that characterises so much of the architectural decoration of the house. This, in turn, is even closer to the form of the banqueting house which Thomas

Cecil built in the garden at Wimbledon. Jean Cousin in *De Perspective*, sent to Cecil by Throckmorton in 1561 also illustrates a plan of precisely this type;¹⁹⁰ while as Alberti pointed out "the Ancients before their houses made either a Portico, or at least a Porch, not always with straight lines but sometimes with a curve."¹⁹¹

The effort to achieve an intellectually rigorous and conceptually conceived symmetry and balance that related part to part and part to whole throughout the main body of the completed sixteenth-century house was, in part, frustrated by the circumstances of the existing fabric of the building. Swans turn to geese on the north front. But the 'mistakes' that are so evident here are not simply the result of negligence in execution or a lack of understanding or appreciation in creating a symmetrical two-dimensional facade. They are the result of a far more complex and ambitious undertaking involving eight major fronts. Architecture considered as mass rather than facade, in which the "bone structure" of the interior is by and large related logically to the outer skin of the building. This concept was a great deal more demanding architecturally than the construction of the "beautiful shell"¹⁹² in which Longleat was being encased during the same period, and certainly more so than Brown's fake wall of the eighteenth century. To attempt this in a highly complex structure, where issues other than those of a purely architectural nature were of equal consequence, was extremely ambitious; particularly so in a building where the fundamental geometry was not as pure as it might appear to the naked eye or even to the surveyor's computations.

The more formal division between the public and the private sides of the house is an acknowledgement of the separation of the functions between the private needs of a great family house and the more 'professional' corporate hospitality areas designed with the accommodation and entertainment of the monarch and the court in mind. At the end of the seventeenth century the 5th Earl in effect made the whole house a private domain. The great hall was abandoned,¹⁹³ The parade galleries were converted into bedrooms and the

state rooms re-fitted and remodelled to display his magnificent collections and to allow for private entertainment on a grand, but less numerous, scale.

Now that the public and private functions of the house once again operate separately, its double life is organized on fundamentally the same principles as existed in the sixteenth century. On the ground floor, Gandy Deering's corridors now connect the north range to the seventeenth-century reception rooms in the south range which substitute for those on the first floor of the north range. Otherwise there is access to the private kitchens in the east range and to the second floor, by-passing the piano nobile, by the north-west stair tower. The area of the house open to the public begins with the great kitchen followed by the circuit of the piano nobile, taken in reverse from that of the sixteenth century, and ending with the descent of the "Hell" stairway into the great hall, itself occasionally reserved for prestige corporate hospitality functions. The only place where these separate lives within the house coincide is on the Roman stair, just as they did in the sixteenth century.

- 1 In the sample taken by Stone & Stone the Cecils were one of only four cases found
between 1600 and 1880 in which a younger son (Robert) was also endowed with
large estates (Stone & Stone 1984, 83)
- 2 The phrase was used by Henry Percy, Dorothy's brother-in-law, in a letter to Cecil
recommending the match by which the Cecils were linked to "the Nevilles and the
Percys and the Manners of Rutland, three of the most distinguished families in the
kingdom" (Read 1955, 309, and quoting SP Dom 12/21/26)
- 3 This is analysed in detail below
- 4 The stair towers were altered by Gandy Deering, but their underlying dimensions
have remained constant as is evident from sections of the towers still visible
above the corridors (see below)
- 5 Till 1975, 982-3
- 6 The levels of the leads, which have been entirely re-roofed during the past 12
years, have been raised quite considerably and the ridge height increased to
conform with modern fall levels, reducing the apparent height of Brown's
alteration. (Wilson (unpublished) 1982- 1994, Vol 2, 7.1-7.53)
- 7 Till 1975, 983
- 8 Even if the earlier roof was double ridged, this would have precluded an attic
storey and furthermore, a lead walk in-between the roofs would have afforded no
view on either side, and would therefore have been very unlikely to have a grand
stair as an approach
- 9 The crescent, denoting in heraldry a younger son, as appears on Robert Cecil's
arms, is not of course applicable at Burghley.
- 10 Guillaume 1985, 35-36
- 11 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 No 307, Kemp to Cecil, 17 September 1575
- 12 Palladio, Ed. Ware 1738 Bk. I, Ch XXVIII, 34
- 13 The architraves of the north service or lodging ranges have these finer mouldings,
but they too were added in the second building phase. They do occur on the
turrets of the buttresses of the east range, but these, as discussed below, almost
certainly date from the seventeenth century
- 14 HMC Salisbury Vol 3 No 575, August 27 1587
- 15 See below, HMC Salisbury Vol 2 No 307, Kemp to Cecil 17 Sept 1575
- 16 HMC Salisbury No 135, June 16 1573
- 17 See Clifton-Taylor 1987, 297, on the use of "green" timber in timber- framed
buildings, also applicable to the *timber framed parts of stone buildings*,
including the roofs.
- 18 Wilson (unpublished) 1982-1994, Vol 2, 9.4 The original oak structure with
openings for windows or louvres on each side was discovered beneath cement
render. This was repaired and a new moulding under the eaves was designed by
Richard Hewlings and the frame was faced with new lead cladding
- 19 The height levels are within a tolerance of 3ins (76.2mm)
- 20 de l'Orme 1576, Livre IX, 256-257
- 21 Gotch 1914, 299
- 22 St John Hope 1913, 170, translation of the account of Humphrey Mitchell in Latin,
agreed by John Norris and Henry Hawthorn (Latin text, St John Hope, 1913, 284)
- 23 Appendix A, 2 and Appendix B,1
- 24 These are hidden under the flap showing the stairs to the first floor on Thorpe's
ground-floor plan (T/010) mentioned in chapter 3. The change in level is now
effected further to the north, by a stair of eleven risers between 038 and 039, and
what are now cellar areas under 039 and part of 010 would have been part of the
exposed 'ground floor' when Thorpe made his plan

-
- 25 See for instance, Penner 1991, 54:
 "kitchens require high rates of exhaust...with an impervious non-slip floor....
 close links with the banqueting kitchen (from the banqueting hall) through a
 service lobby (to give noise reduction and make possible the temporary holding of
 food and beverage service) are essential... The service corridor [screens passage]
 must extend to each of the areas which can be divided [pastry, dry larder, cellars
 etc.] and should provide access through from food preparation and wine storage"
- 26 Spenser, Eds Smith and de Selincourt 1991, 115 cant ix, v 29
- 27 Waldstein, Ed. Groos 1981, f 159, 113
- 28 Nichols 1828 Vol 1, 96
- 29 Wotton 1624, 70-71
- 30 Waldstein, Ed Groos 1981, f 159, 113
- 31 The dimensions given allow for the later bookcases, added c. 1830
- 32 Girouard 1963, 23
- 33 T. Wright 1838, Vol 2, 98
- 34 M. Thompson 1987, 8
- 35 Long 1941, 344
- 36 Waldstein f. 159 Ed. Groos 1981, 113
- 37 Lewis 1981, 374
- 38 Wilson (unpublished)1982-94, Vol 2, 9.5 -9.10
- 39 Evidence of this was observed by Nicholas Cooper of RCHME when the interior of
 the hall was scaffolded for a brief period in 1993. No further investigations
 have been possible as the interior roof is inaccessible.
- 40 See MacCaffrey 1961, 99
- 41 The dating of this addition is discussed below.
- 42 Thomas Thorpe's 1623 map shows the garden here not to have been very wide (see
 Plan 6 & Plans 24a & 24b) The reconstruction of the elevation has been based on
 Thorpe's plan
- 43 Hussey 1953, 1831. Both window and door were blocked when
 J. Pierrepont made his engraving of the front in 1818
- 44 There is no documentary evidence concerning the brick vault, but from the style
 and quality of its construction Dr Till and others consider this to be the most
 probable period. I am grateful to Jon Culverhouse for this information
- 45 This shaft has recently been blocked by brickwork 1995), necessary for building
 conservation and fire precautions
- 46 Clifton-Taylor 1987, 103 & 104. Although only half the weight of Cotswold stone
 roofs, this still makes the load about one ton to every 200sq ft.
- 47 The tower at the northern end of the surviving north-east service range has these
 same profiles, but the stone roof is similar to those of the main house turrets.
- 48 See below in this chapter
- 49 There was a genuine window behind a chimney-breast at Fawsley Hall
 (Pevsner/Cherry Northamptonshire 1973, 215), but the height of the hall
 chimneypiece rules this out at Burghley
- 50 Girouard 1979, 1399
- 51 Nicholas 1847, 125
- 52 Laneham 1575, printed in Nichols 1823 Vol 1, 472.
- 53 Gombrich 1984, 209
- 54 This was recorded by photograph, but is not clear enough to reproduce
- 55 Waldstein f.159 Ed. Groos 1981, 113
- 56 Illustrated in Girouard 1983, 95 and Girouard 1980, 87
- 57 BL Lansdowne MSS 118; Peck 1732-35 Vol 2 Lib iii, 31

-
- 58 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 No 133, Kemp to Cecil, June 7 1573
- 59 Hatfield MSS C/202/108, Kemp to Cecil 26 May 1573
- 60 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 No 133
- 61 SP Dom 12/181/32 In Cecil's famous defence against alleged attacks made on the magnificence of his buildings in 1585, mentioned above, he claimed that Burghley was "of my mother's inheritance, who liveth and is the owner therof and I but a farmer."
- 62 Exeter MSS 51/18
- 63 Fiennes, 1947, 70
- 64 Peck 1732-5 Vol 2 Lib. vi No XXII, 40
- 65 Walpole, Ed. 1927-8, 58
- 66 This was the situation, for example, at Audley End in the sixteenth- century house, where access from the hall to the great chamber above was through the parlour, before the Jacobean plan was effected. (Drury 1980, 7) An alternative route to the chapel at Burghley would have been via the stairs in T/110
- 67 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 No 307, Kemp to Cecil 17 September 1575
- 68 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 No 307
- 69 Appendix A, 10 lns 16-17
- 70 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 No 267 , Cecil to Lord Cobham 23 July 1575, written from Burghley. Printed in Hayes & Murdin, 1740-59, Vol 1, 281
- 71 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 no 285
- 72 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 No 307, Kemp to Cecil 17 September 1575
- 73 Hussey 1953, 1964
- 74 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 No 586, 11 September 1578
- 75 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 No 307, Kemp to Cecil 17 September 1575
- 76 The triumphal arch porch now on the west side of the gate-house has been transposed, and may have been the entrance to Leicester's new lodging block, which also had canted bay windows, (Thompson 1987, 26) or possibly was originally the entrance on the north side of the gate-tower.
- 77 The illustration in Howard 1987, 54, gives a good idea of the effect.
- 78 North Eds. Colvin & Newman 1981, 136, although North disapproved of canted "Gothick" bays and favoured variations of square plans.
- 79 I am grateful to Paula Henderson for pointing out the significance of this innovation at this date at Burghley
- 80 The novelty of such an arrangement as examined by Howard, 1994, 257-268 has already been discussed with regard to Burghley in Chapter 3
- 81 Hatfield MSS Vol 143, Nos. 31, 32, 46 & 48
- 82 Nichols 1823, Vol 2, 524-51
- 83 Tytler 1839, Vol 1, 242. see Chapter 1 for earlier discussion of this work at Windsor
- 84 The full text of the letter is printed in St John Hope 1913, Vol 1, 273
- 85 SP Dom. 12/114/11
- 86 King's Works Vol 3, 326; St John Hope 1913, 279.
- 87 MPF 150, 254, 266
- 88 Hawthorn's proposal to link the gate tower into the gallery in this way was not in the event taken up
- 89 See Summerson in King's Works Vol 3, 326
- 90 King's Works Vol 4, 20
- 91 See Coope 1986, 51
- 92 DNB 1975, 935 entry for Sir Thomas Heneage

-
- 93 Coope 1986, 61
- 94 Coope 1986, 64
- 95 PRO E317/Herts/26 f. 25
- 96 Summerson 1959, 121
- 97 Guillaume, 1985, 27-47
- 98 Hatfield MSS 143/24, 143/29&30
- 99 Made in preparation for the Law Courts to remove there during the plague. Cecil's annotations indicate where the temporary council chamber should be, and no doubt he was in charge of planning all the allocations which included the Court of Wards (King's Works III, 255, plan 256)
- 100 Clapham, Eds. C. Read and E. Read 1951, 79. Clapham in this instance is referring to Cecil's role in state matters of council "for that nothing was thought well done whereof he was not the contriver and director"
- 101 Girouard gives an excellent description of the experience of these effects at Hardwick, Girouard 1983, 152
- 102 The undersides of these turrets still exist behind the framing of Gandy Deering's first-floor corridor, (information supplied by Alan Wilson)
- 103 Changes to the floor levels at this time may also have exacerbated the settlement of the walls of the Prospect Room
- 104 Exeter MSS 51/18
- 105 This has survived intact because unlike the main rooms below, the closet beneath it has not had its ceiling raised.
- 106 Mercer 1962, 102-108, notes that architectural panelling was not common even in the seventeenth century. Coope however, notes it as widespread in luxury architecture of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, but the earliest examples cited that are comparable with Burghley are from the 1590s. (Coope 1986, 63) The architectural panels and screen now in the church at Holdenby, however, are of a similar date.
- 107 Room 119, and adjoining closet, 120 have solid lime plaster floors beneath the parquet flooring, but though this might suggest their floor levels had not been altered this would mean a change in floor level within the space of the long gallery which would be very unusual. Thorpe does not show any change of level, nor does he indicate steps down into the closets, which would have had to be within the main body of the long gallery as the panelling now below floor level confirms there were no steps within the wall thickness of the opening into the closet. The stone landing at the head of the 'Hell' stairs (114) is also not a structural feature, but bedded on a timber frame (information supplied by Alan Wilson)
- 108 In the corridor on the east side the full length of the windows is exposed internally (224) whereas in the bedrooms facing west internal panelling now mask the lower lights beneath the transoms
- 109 This material is also found in the walls of the kitchen lantern contained within the roof space, where they have not been reconstructed, and in other of the roof spaces in the east range as well as in the ceiling construction inside what is now a cupboard on the east wall of the bay in the south stair chamber (114)
- 110 Appendix A, 10 Ins. 9-13
- 111 Girouard 1983, 81, 150, 110
- 112 Girouard 1983, 52-53
- 113 Appendix A, 10 Ins. 9-11
- 114 HMC Salisbury Vol 2, no. 586
- 115 John Smythson's drawing of the panelling at Theobalds is titled "seelinge" for instance (Fig 7.7a)
- 116 North, Eds Colvin & Newman 1981, 160

-
- 117 Bacon, Ed. Hawkins 1972, 135
 118 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 no 586
 119 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 no 607
 120 Bacon, Ed. Hawkins 1972, 134
 121 Information supplied by Alan Wilson, verbal observation regarding the earlier interpretation of the distortion.
 122 See 1583 schedule of accommodation printed in Hayes and Murdin 1740-59, and Nichols 1823 Vol 1, 308 for the 1572 Schedule
 123 Palladio, Ed. Ware 1738 Bk. I Ch. XXVIII, 34
 124 Bek, 1985, 120
 125 Howard 1987, 83
 126 It was following this visit that Cecil wrote to Hatton declaring he found "no one thing of greater grace than your stately ascent from your hall to your great chamber". Nicolas 1847, 224
 127 The stair from Theobalds is now installed in Herstmonceux Castle
 128 There is still a change of level upwards between the anti-chapel (148) and the adjacent Dark Nursery (149). The lower-level of two existing roof structures roof structure of 150 is constructed by the diagonal beam method, and a diagonal beam discovered in the adjoining room (149) suggests this has a similar structure, (Wilson (unpublished) 1982-94 Pt. 2, 10.1-10.3) based on the principle recommended by Serlio for spanning with short timbers, as used over the hall at Wollaton. It seems likely this was the means used to replace the old hall roof with a flat lead roof in Cecil's second phase of building. (Serlio Ed 1982 Bk. 1, Ch 1 Fol. 12)
 129 Burghley House Catalogue of Pictures: "Sketch for the ceiling in the Music Gallery l.r: Henry Mitchell fecit and inscribed on verso. Pen and brown ink. Charles Hind, Sotheby's 1992." There is no provenance or date for the sketch, which was not recognized as deriving from the ceiling in the bay, and no music gallery has been identified
 130 Platt 1986, 175 & 169
 131 See below fn 131
 132 I am grateful to Clare Gapper for her observations on the surviving plasterwork in this window bay, from which my comments are drawn, and also for the comparison with the Charterhouse ceiling.
 133 HMC Salisbury Vol 2, 586
 134 Wilson (unpublished) 1982-94, Vol 3, 16.1:- The present timbers span east west and take their bearings on the masonry cross walls inserted at the end of the seventeenth century. The sixteenth-century main timbers must have spanned north/south over the open cloisters below.
 135 Till's notes on Verrio papers in Exeter MSS special drawer 54/5/A, and Culpepper Tanner's inventory of 1688, Exeter MSS 51/18 for the positions of the rooms. The new suite of reception rooms created on the ground floor by the 5th Earl were as important, if not more so, in the hierarchy of the house than the private apartments of the Earl and Countess which were on the ground floor of the west range.
 136 The stairs are too faint on Haynes plan to register in reproduction, but are clearly distinguishable on the original at Burghley House. Thorpe also shows 17 steps to the first floor on the stair in T/010)
 137 North Eds. Colvin & Newman 1981, 77. The 5th Earl made the ground floor rooms in the south range into an important suite (fn 134) so North is not necessarily only referring to the splendid height of the first floor rooms by the late seventeenth century
 138 Summerson 1959, 120

-
- 139 Waldstein f.159 Ed. Groos 1981, 113. Robert Adam's unexecuted proposal for the stair at Burghley made in 1772 has trompe l'oeil galleries on the south and north walls where these real galleries would have been in the sixteenth century (Richardson 1992, 87-88)
- 140 Key to Haynes ground floor plan of the house 1755, preserved at Burghley House, Plan F9 (the wording is too faint to reproduce)
- 141 Palladio, Ed. Ware 1738 Bk. I Ch. XXVIII, 34. Thorpe is inconsistent in not having a flap showing such a stair underneath as he does in T/010, but the importance of the stair above and the insignificance of this short stair may account for the omission
- 142 Palladio, Ed. Ware 1738 Bk. I Ch. XXVIII, 34
- 143 Palladio, Ed. Ware 1738 Bk. I Ch. XXVIII, 34
- 144 Nicolas 1847, 224
- 145 See Guillaume & Chastel, Eds. 1985 (*passim*).
- 146 Sohn 1985, in Guillaume & Chastel 1985, 126
- 147 Thurley 1993, 53-54
- 148 Thurley 1993, 118-119
- 149 The designation 'George' for these rooms is discussed in chapter 7
- 150 Plaster fragments trapped between the soffits of original oak ceiling joists and the masonry of party walls inserted in the seventeenth century confirm that there were earlier ceilings above the Verrio ceilings. (Wilson (unpublished) 1982-94 Part 2, 7.11)
- 151 Colvin notes that while the term "clerestory window" is frequently met with in the Elizabethan Royal Works accounts it "appears to mean an ordinary window, flush with the wall as distinct from a "bay window" (King's Works 4, 30 fn. 2)
- 152 Access to examine this first-hand has not been possible. The photograph of the painted decoration was taken by Lady Exeter during the Second World War, and is preserved in the Burghley House File at NBR, Swindon.
- 153 Drury 1980, 2
- 154 Girouard 1973, 1670
- 155 Printed in Hayes and Murdin 1740-1759
- 156 It is similar to the stencilled wainscot decoration at Hardwick, completed and paid for in 1596, "probably deriving from designs for "broderie", Coope 1986, 63
- 157 See earlier references, they are listed on the 1688 inventory, (Exeter MSS 51/18)
- 158 Again, I am grateful to Alan Wilson for the information concerning the internal jambs. This does not, however explain what looks to be a similar blocked window on the second floor of the pavilion, but which reaches above the level of the roof and is part of the false wall added by Brown in the eighteenth century which remains a mystery.
- 159 Wilson Vol 1, 3.5-3.7. This has taken place throughout most of the house. The only surviving windows with their original glazing, or conserved in their original form using glass recovered from elsewhere, are some of those on the second floor facing into the courtyard, most notably W/236/3 and W/236/2 on the upper landing of the Roman stair. Also the windows of the prospect room facing onto the courtyard (blanked off from the interior). Generally in the upper story windows, the nineteenth century wrought iron frames are being replaced by stainless steel frames, tailor-made on site. Where the stone mullion windows have hardwood sliding sashes below the transoms, as is the case in most of the outward-facing windows, below the second floor, these are being replaced with lighter weight sashes. Again the existing sashes are thought to be nineteenth century, though no record of the work has come to light. (Wilson 1982-94, 14.1-15.4)

-
- 160 Till 1975, 983-984
- 161 When under attack in 1585, as mentioned above, Cecil claimed "my house of Burghley is of my mother's inheritance, who liveth and is the owner thereof and I but a farmer [tenant]" while Theobalds was "increased by occasion of her Majesty's often coming, whom to please I never would omit to strain myself to more charges ..." SP Dom 12/181/32
- 162 Barnett, 1969, 93
- 163 Summerson 1957, 210
- 164 Hatfield MSS CP 143/99
- 165 Summerson 1957, 215 observes that his surviving plans "show him to have been an extremely careful, accurate and even elegant executant but they are mostly of a kind which leaves his designing abilities out of account"
- 166 Exeter MSS 57/7
- 167 Barnett 1969, 124-125
- 168 Exeter MSS 62/77
- 169 Barnett 1969, 125-126
- 170 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 no 575, Thomas Cecil to his father 27 August 1587
- 171 Appendix A, 10 ln.5
- 172 Bacon, Ed. Hawkins 1972, 134
- 173 Girouard 1992, 59. This connection, Girouard relates, was "suggested by Prof. Jean Guillaume, when he walked up the staircase ...in 1987"
- 174 Guillaume 1985, 36
- 175 D. Lewis, 1981, 370: "the wonderful Scala d'Oro in the Palazzo Ducale, long seen as one of the tangible results of Vettor's embassy to the Court of France in 1547" Lewis cites Tafuri's Jacopo Sansovino (Padua, 1969, 84-86) together "with previous literature."
- 176 See Mignot, in Ed. Guillaume & Chastel 1985, 50-54
- 177 From a graphic analysis undertaken of these variations I have not been able to identify any particular rational
- 178 Gotch 1914, 299
- 179 The windows here have been significantly altered, probably at the end of the seventeenth century, after the 1688 inventory when the internal layout was altered and the range refurbished (see immediately below). The internal plan no longer relates directly to the exterior and there is now internal masonry behind the glazing (W/032/1 & 2) (Wilson, 1982-1994, Vol 1, 3.14)
- 180 Stairs emphasized externally in this way were a feature of a number of major 16th- century French chateaux, (Guillaume 1985, 34 & 37)
- 181 Exeter MSS 51/18
- 182 Exeter MSS 51/18, & Leatham 1992, 125
- 183 Gotch 1904, 86
- 184 Now known as Manor Lodge, completed c.1595 (Girouard 1983, 153 & 131)
- 185 Girouard, 1983, 153
- 186 See Chapter 4
- 187 See Plan
- 188 The garden walls at Theobalds were thus coated, and there are a number of payments made at Windsor for "roughcasting" the walls. (St John Hope 1913, 268 & 275), Stucco was considered to be a smarter finish than rubblestone, with a venerable history dating back to Vitruvius, and favoured by Palladio. Cecil's own declaration that he had "made the rough stone walls" of his father's house "to be of square" testifies to the value he put on smooth building finishes. (SP Dom 12/181/32)

-
- 189 In the 1688 Inventory "Lord Burghley's Stable" is listed with the offices in this area. This most probably referred to the 5th Earl's heir rather than a historic reference to William Cecil, but it shows that there was at least one stable remaining here (Exeter MSS 51/18)
- 190 Cousin 1560, K iiij
- 191 Alberti Bk. IX, Ch. iii Ed. Leoni 1755, 190
- 192 Walpole 1927-28, 45
- 193 This is inferred from the list of its contents in the 1688 inventory when it was obviously being used as a store room (Exeter MSS 51/18 & Leatham 1992, 196)

CHAPTER SEVEN & CONCLUSION : "ITS PURPOSE IS ITS USE" THE HOUSE OF BURGHLEY ; PART 2 & CONCLUSION

How then can the internal plan of the House of Burghley, like its surroundings, as completed at the end of the 1580s be interpreted with regard to its function as an intended locus for the monarch and court? How, for instance, were the various configurations within the plan disposed to promote and control the highly politicized social activity of the court? How was the flow of human traffic through the building organised and checked? What provision was there for ceremonial presentation and for the audiences for these rituals?

By the time Cecil embarked on his second phase of building he had an unrivalled combination of political and architectural experience, and one can anticipate a high level of concordance between the dynamics of the architectural design and master plan and the dynamics of the corporate body it was to house. As Starkey has observed of Henry VIII's palaces, "palace building created a more binding framework for behaviour than any ordinance."¹ It played a crucial role in how power was exercised, and where, and by which members of the administration, court, or household in relation to the monarch.²

In broad terms, royal palace examples can be used as models for comparison with Burghley. Research concerning the subject in the sixteenth century, however, has been focussed on Henry VIII's buildings, and whereas the Elizabethan court was housed within these buildings, Elizabeth's style of government, and largely female household, were very different from those of her father. The extensive remodelling of Whitehall and Westminster in the early years of her reign may be taken as an indication of this change. As discussed in Chapter One, Cecil himself almost certainly had a hand in this undertaking,³ and from the beginning he operated from the centre of these twin hubs of court and administration which overlapped one another physically and functionally.⁴ Added to this, the pattern of behaviour of the court on progress was itself not the same as

in the more prescribed and established routine of the standing palaces, or even of the less frequently visited royal houses where there was no courtier 'host' presiding.

On the progresses the queen's two bodies, her public body politic and her private persona, were inevitably drawn closer together in the less formal and more congested circumstances. Carefully staged visual access to the queen by the whole corpus of her court was essential to the image-promoting purpose of these visits. On the other hand, the increased pressure to invade the physical space reserved for the monarch, as well as to breach the psychological distance between her and her closest group of subjects, still had to be punctiliously regulated. Personal access to the queen was the most highly prized political goal, wherever she might be. The queen might choose at times to 'common' with the least of her subjects, but the setting of her court was acknowledged as one of the most formally magnificent in Europe.⁵ During the apparently recreational 'summer recess' of progress time the business of government still had to function and the Privy Council continued to meet during progresses. Indeed local matters were often added to the agenda of national issues.⁶ Meanwhile, the informal politicking surrounding the queen's presence under these less prescribed conditions, if anything, intensified.

Jean de Vulcob's report to the French ambassador in London, sent from Stamford during the queen's visit at the beginning of August 1566, provides a very apposite first-hand account, giving a vivid impression of the effects of this shift of emphasis that paralleled the shift of location, and is therefore worth examining in some detail.⁷

On Sunday 4th August, de Vulcob, who was shadowing the court as representative of the French ambassador, Bochetel, walked to Burghley to lobby Cecil for an interview with the queen, who was expected there that afternoon. Last minute preparations were still in full swing at the house, but while he was with Cecil, news came that the Cecils' daughter, Anne, was suspected of having contracted smallpox, the disease that had nearly taken the queen's life in October 1562, and which she dreaded above all others. The royal

accommodation had to be hastily re-scheduled to Cecil's house at the "Grey Friars" in Stamford where his mother lived (Fig 7.1).⁸

Undeterred, de Vulcob diverted to Jane Cecil's house where the Earl of Leicester happened upon him while he was waiting in hope of an audience with the queen. De Vulcob made the best of this fortuitous opportunity and was able to talk alone with Leicester "tout longuement que je voulus".⁹ He primed Leicester with some compliments from the ambassador. The subject was the queen's marriage, the hottest political topic of the moment, and of keen diplomatic interest to the French. Leicester was on good terms with Bochetel and the French monarchy regarding this matter, although the month before he had ostensibly been representing the queen in the negotiations with the Spanish envoys for a rival marriage with the Emperor's brother, the Archduke Charles of Austria. Presently, as ^{de}Vulcob reported, Leicester, "parlant plus ouvertement", intimated that he believed the queen would never marry, but if she did so within the kingdom, it would almost certainly be to him. Spain's candidate was currently in favour over a French rival, so Leicester's remarks were no doubt less unguarded than they appeared. Even so, it was a considerable intelligence coup - as from the horse's mouth - for the young man to report. Furthermore, Leicester managed to arrange an immediate private audience for ^{de}Vulcob with the queen, a privilege he would have been unlikely to obtain so swiftly through the 'usual channels' that operated at court in London.¹⁰ Already one can see that the move from Burghley House had loosened the temporary control over access to the queen that Cecil would have continued to enjoy under his own roof. De Vulcob, meanwhile, was able to supply another eagerly sought piece of diplomatic intelligence to the French, a first-hand account of the appearance of the queen's health at close quarters.

As well as Leicester and Cecil, Killigrew, Throckmorton, Mildmay, Norfolk, Clinton and Sussex were all circling around in the area and de Vulcob managed to meet with all of these influential figures. Lower down the social and political scale, he picked up valuable gossip about numbers and movements of troops from a courier arrived from

Ireland. He observed Leicester and Sussex (regarded just before this time as fierce political enemies) talking alone together and apparently amicably, for some time. He reported on the latest gossip circulating on the proposed progress to Leicester's house; according to the Killigrews the queen would cancel because of the excessive expense Leicester was preparing to outlay.¹¹ Popular court opinion however, attributed it to the rumours of a possible marriage between them, and that there were those who had "soufflé aux oreilles de Sa Majesté pour la dissuader d'y aller", for fear of a scandal.¹² Leicester had, de Vulcob opined, not lost all his credit with the queen and was still able to "tourner Sa Magesté de ça ou de là."¹³ De Vulcob concluded by apologizing that his previous dispatch had had to be sent by Cecil's carrier, implying, no doubt correctly, that it would have been opened before it reached the ambassador.

It is clear from de Vulcob's account that politically the court was far from being on holiday. The power centre that revolved around the queen was temporarily located about the small market town of Stamford and every corner of the normally parochial district was seething with political activity.

As the everyday language of contemporary twentieth-century politics reveals - 'corridors of power', 'the word on the corridors', closeted together', 'backstairs intrigue', 'kitchen cabinet' - the architectural organisation of ostensibly informal peripheral spaces plays a central role in the political process. Political activity leaks out from its planned forums. The whole modus operandi of the 'lobby system', for instance, takes its name from such an unassuming enclosure. Communication areas not only provide physical links between major theatres of power, they equally become the arteries of human *intercommunication*.

Nowhere was this more evident than under the patronage system of the "politics of access and influence" of Elizabethan government.¹⁴ Cecil's shop for cunning men as his regime was referred to, depended as heavily on the informal networking of the court as

upon its formal channels for gathering and disseminating intelligence, using sharp eyes and ears, like those the French had in de Vulcob. De Vulcob's opportunism was that of the successful courtier (he later became an ambassador), employed directly for personal gain, or for more oblique self-interest, on behalf of a patron. Its skills relied on vigilant watching and waiting, on the one hand to scrutinize behaviour patterns and body language, as he did with Leicester and Sussex, and on the other to catch the eye or bend the ear of the most powerful members of the court, or even the queen herself. Spenser's disappointed courtier, the narrator in his poem Prothalamion, whose "idle hopes" entertained in his "long and fruitlesse stay/In Princes Court"¹⁵ had failed to understand the hidden agenda of pro-active inactivity, to see and be seen. Progress times offered excellent opportunities to show off, to display prowess in tournaments or horsemanship and dash out hunting, or to fashion witty complimentary conceits for the participatory entertainments and masques. In 1568 for example, Cecil wrote to Henry Sidney admonishing him for having taken his "darling Philip" away from Oxford "not only from his books but from the commodity to have been seen by my lords, his uncles,... I think indeed either you forgot the Queen's Progress to be so near Oxford".¹⁶ Investitures were a regular feature of progress visits. On the 1566 progress, the queen knighted two men at Fotheringhay, and when the court moved on from Stamford to Admiral Clinton's house at Sempringham another five or six, including the admiral's son.¹⁷ Thomas Cecil was knighted at Kenilworth after excelling in the jousts in 1575,¹⁸ and Robert Cecil at Theobalds in 1591.

At Burghley the plan allowed for the formal and informal political topoi necessary to the court's interactive socio-political dynamics to be amalgamated. The "parade" route through the house is aptly designated as such.¹⁹ One can understand from Thorpe's plans how this was organised into a series of single-point perspective vistas, a new one opening up at the closure of each predecessor. At the same time, the processional path, which follows this central perspective, has wide margins for audiences to either side. These in turn are fringed by a succession of bay windows, closets, tower rooms, balconies, banqueting houses, a diversity of "pretty retiring places for conference"²⁰ that provide a

gloss of intimacy on the borders of the grand formal spaces (Plans 1 & 2). Nowhere is this more evident than in the long gallery complex. But the parade route overall is organized so that it is the communicating spaces which become the grand arenas while the 'rooms' which open from them on either side - "breakout spaces" as they are known in modern planning jargon - are miniature cabinets, providing the more intimate asides and sub-texts that enrich its complex structure, architecturally and politically. The formal theatre, in which the image of power is located and propagated through ritual performance, is combined with the more informal spaces where the realpolitik resides. It becomes an 'open' plan, and the ideal environment for being on show, while being part of an audience; free to scrutinize the intimacy of others from within a crowd. Without disturbing the decorum or the impressive dimensions of the grand formal spaces, the humanising effect of these sociable fringing bays allow for a less reserved atmosphere on their margins. The effect is well illustrated by the image of a man sitting in a trompe l'oeil window seat in the interior of the Villa Godi or "the charms of villa life: scenes of eating and drinking and music-making"²¹ that animate the interiors of Palladio's Villa Caldogno (Fig 7.2). In order to implant this human animation into the abstract perfection of the enclosed space, however, it has been furnished artificially, within illusory bays painted on the walls of the plain oblong salone. At Burghley one also has to imagine similar scenes, but here they would have been of 'real' life in real space.

The existence not only of the building itself but of near-contemporary first-floor as well as ground-floor plans by Thorpe is in marked contrast to most of the great Elizabethan houses and all of Henry VIII's palaces. As it is from ground-plans that the logistics of a building are normally plotted in the architectural design process, at the other end, one can therefore expect to understand a good deal of the functional rationale of a building from the same source.²²

Taking the spaces as they were designed to be encountered, the parade route starts in the courtyard, facing the clock-tower entrance to the interior of the house (Fig A.6e). At

this point the guest might well have been in the psychological dilemma Alberti hoped would be stimulated by the opening stage of a house: "Let those who are already entered be in doubt whether they shall for Pleasure continue where they are, or pass on further to those other Beauties which tempt them on"²³

Tempting them onwards and upwards was a short flight of steps up to the open triumphal arch of the clock-tower frontispiece, leading into a broad passage and another upward flight (T/049). The progression was towards the light from the tall window of the east porch directly ahead (W/T/012/2). Before reaching the porch, the public route turned through ninety degrees, dramatically revealing the full effect of the 'lightsome' great hall through its columned entrance screen. By directing the route outwards initially through the double pile of the east range from the courtyard, the sense of size was magnified. At the same time, the scene was shifted from the classical splendour of the courtyard to the equal magnificence of the vernacular-style hall (Fig 7.3). If the sculptures or relief panels of "Medea and Jason and of Hector and Cassandra"²⁴ that were in the hall when Waldstein visited in 1600, were in their original position, iconographic continuity was nevertheless sustained.

First impressions of generous proportions were linked with the traditions of freely-offered hospitality signalled by the feasting hall, indicative of the "good cheer" that Cecil had hoped would not be lacking on the proposed visit of the court to Burghley in 1566.²⁵ While the form of the great hall still signified its familiar role, in effect it functioned as a guard chamber, acting as a suitably glamorous reception area and check point, where those not given the privilege of rising to the state rooms could be contained.²⁶ A similar situation to that at Burghley was adopted at Audley End at the beginning of the seventeenth century where the ground floor hall became a guard chamber for both the king's and the queen's state apartments which were in separate ranges on the first floor.²⁷

Having processed the length of the hall to the dais end another right-angled turn marked an equal re-orientation of the architectural atmosphere, away from the sociable environment of the hall to the more "stately ascent" of the south stair chamber.²⁸ As Waldstein noted, "Going up the stairs you see the names and coats-of-arms of some of the Garter Knights".²⁹ A new decorum was underlined by the introduction of the Garter theme, itself the object of one the principal ceremonial events of the Elizabethan calendar, setting a suitably elevated tone at the point of rising up towards the presence of the monarch. It would also have been a clear reminder that Cecil was one of an exclusive and international membership of only twenty-five Knights of the Order, who, as Castiglione observed, "are always honoured, even in great courts".³⁰ The stair created a funnel from the larger space of the hall, from where the flow of human traffic could have been monitored, while at the same time slowing physical movement to the dignified pace of ascent. A new vista opened beyond the stair, viewed through the frame of the classical columned screen on the landing above, to what must have been the great or presence chamber (T/114 & T/115). The focal point and closure of this centrally organised perspective was the far west end of this chamber, some 90ft (28m) from the foot of the staircase. This would be the obvious and correct position for a canopy of state or throne to frame and magnify the distant and elevated figure of the monarch, either symbolically or in person.³¹

As North was to recommend, stairs "should be made as easy, delightfull, and inviting as is possible; or, in short, as deceiving as may be, to perswade there is no such inconvenience as staires, by bribing and entreteining all the senses with better objects".³² In this case the "better object" would have been no less than the monarch.

The galleried landings to either side at first-floor level presented ideal viewing platforms from which to witness the processional spectacles associated with the ritual etiquette of entry to the queen's presence (Fig. 6.29a). As with the bays and alcoves, the sense of audience and of an architectural environment designed to be completed by a real

human presence is built into the plan. It contrasts again with that which has to be provided provided fictively by Veronese's trompe l'oeil gallery in the vestibule of Palladio's Villa Maser, or Mantegna's watching figures in the illusory cupola of the Camera degli Sposi, at the Gonzaga court of Mantua. Here the usual relationship of image to beholder is inverted and the figures in the paintings become a tireless audience for the spectacle of 'real' life (Fig 7.4).

The effect of ascending the broad shaft of the stairs into the well-lit open space above must have been just as dramatic as that achieved by the present vast single space of the stairway. The psychological effect is now organized to work in reverse, as one descends towards the painted vision of 'Hell', having quit the 'Heaven Room' above.

Once in the presence chamber there was further allowance for the courtly audience to line the walls and overflow or withdraw into the bays on either side, without interrupting the central processional and visual path. The well-known painting of Queen Elizabeth Receiving Dutch Emmissaries (c.1585) does not show bay windows, but gives a good idea of such a scene.³³ At the 'head' of the room was a bay looking outward over the south gardens, placed equivalently to that of a bay at the end of a great hall. On the opposite side a balcony opened onto the courtyard, from where it became the centre-piece of this centrally focussed front (T142 & Fig. A.6e). The arrangement anticipates the appearance on the balcony, the presentational format which has become a cliché of royal and other leadership exposure for the very reason that it has proved such an effective means of display. Similar opportunities were offered at Burghley by the balconies leading off the piano nobile at the central point of the west and north fronts of the courtyard. The balcony does not appear to have been a salient feature of royal palace design in England until the seventeenth century when Inigo Jones introduced it in a number of royal houses,³⁴ although balconies were already well established as an effective presentation mechanism on the Continent. In Venice, for example, the balconies on the main façades of the Doge's Palace provided excellent focal points as a public platforms. Palladio's

unadopted proposal for the palace in 1577/8, after the fire, also has a central frontispiece of three superimposed arches flanked by paired columns with niches, emphasizing framed balconies on the upper two floors, which is quite uncharacteristic of his designs for private villas (Fig. 7.5)³⁵

In the interior at Burghley the designation 'George' for these first floor rooms in the south range may be the clue to iconography introduced by William Cecil. The name is first documented in the 1690s, by which time it was obviously the familiar term. Most significantly a payment to Verrio of 1691 for decorating "ye Drawing Roome" is inscribed "memoire de l'or qui entre dans la seconde grande chambre de St George"³⁶ Another account record is for work "upon the staircase to ye George Roomes".³⁷ St George (together with the Virgin Mary)³⁸ was of course the patron saint of the Order of the Garter, and Knights were bound to wear his image, in the form of the "lesser George" at all times.³⁹ Thomas Cecil did not become a Garter Knight until 1601, so the Garter theme noted by Waldstein on the stairs in 1600 must have been introduced by his father, who held it in great regard. When he had briefly become Chancellor of the Order in 1552 Cecil urgently sent for details of the ceremonial of the Toison d'Or (Golden Fleece) in order to familiarize himself with equivalent formalities as practiced on the Continent.⁴⁰ As mentioned above, there were depictions of the Knights of the Golden Fleece at Theobalds.⁴¹ The Garter ceremony was an important event in the Elizabethan calendar, standing in the place of an overt celebration of a saint's day, and membership was regularly used as an instrument of international diplomacy.⁴² Cecil was installed at Windsor on 18 June 1572 on the same day as the Duke of Montmorency became a Garter Knight (as his father had been) for instance, while in France Charles IX was simultaneously honoured.⁴³ Cecil features among the Knights in the ceremonial procession scheme drawn up by Marcus Gheeraerts the Elder and had himself painted in his full Garter robes by the same artist (Fig 7.6). As with the courtyard iconography, a Garter theme extending through the state apartments at Burghley and making reference to the heroic national theme of St

George would have emphasised Cecil's own distinction in relation to the monarch who was automatically head of the Order.

This suite of state rooms at Burghley was the most likely intended destination for the set of tapestries specially woven in Brussels for three main chambers of the house commissioned in 1584.⁴⁴ By July 1587, when they were ready for delivery the total bill, including nearly £200 interest, amounted to £911. 1s. 3d., so they were obviously of some magnificence.⁴⁵ There is no indication of the subject matter of the tapestries in the documents, but as they were specially commissioned their iconography may have been connected with a Garter theme, or at the least have figured Cecil's arms surrounded by the Garter.

The parade route from the presence chamber (T/115) continued via a doorway on the courtyard side of its west wall, from where the next vista stretched forward again some 90ft (28m) through an enfilade of openings to a bay window on the far wall of the long gallery (W/T/125/4). "So as the doors make one visto from end to end, is the perfection one would desire", was North's opinion of this device, a century later.⁴⁶ A second "ample" chamber beyond the presence chamber (T/116), also with large bays overlooking the gardens and courtyard, was followed by a passageway which by-passed a large private room with a pillared chimneypiece, and a smaller chamber, also with a chimneypiece, beyond (T/117 & T/118). Possibly the chimneypiece of the former, which stood at right angles to the window, was the one of highly polished white marble, "not unlike a looking-glass", in which Waldstein claimed he could see the countryside reflected through an open window.⁴⁷ The rooms of the south range would have provided the sequence of increasingly intimate spaces comprising presence chamber, privy chamber, bedchamber and closet, the standards of a royal state suite by the middle of the sixteenth century.⁴⁸ What would have been the state bedchamber (T/117) most probably contained the richly wrought "bed of Indian workmanship with its coverlet embroidered in gold thread" particularly noted by Waldstein, who remarked on a similar "coverlet woven of gold" in a

room furnished with "valuable hangings" at Theobalds.⁴⁹ Because of the expense and specific regal and imperial connotations of gold, even in the royal palaces, bed textiles of cloth of gold or worked with gold thread, were generally only found in the royal bedchambers.⁵⁰

Moving from these principal rooms, the public route continued via the passageway (T/142) to the long gallery. The south west stair tower, however also provided an escape route again as North was to suggest, as a "bolting hole...either for avoiding ceremony or any other reason".⁵¹ It gave vertical access, above to the more private upper gallery - placed similarly to the privy gallery at Theobalds - and very probably as well, to a private suite of rooms for the monarch above the south range.⁵² Via the vyce in the south-west turret of the west gate tower in what was the upper gallery (224), there was further access to the prospect room and the roof walks. Downwards the stair gave onto the west courtyard loggia, and through the outer chamber of the lodgings below, to the south loggia and gardens.

The plan would have allowed for a degree of behind the scenes freedom of movement for the queen to enjoy privately the exercise and open air that Cecil well knew she relished and appreciated. In 1575, for instance, Leicester wrote to inform Cecil of how much the queen was enjoying her stay (probably at Grafton): "I assure your L. I think she never came to a place in her lyfe she lyked better, or commended more; and synce her coming hither, as oft as wether serves, she has not been within-dores. The howse likes her well and her owen lodgings specyally."⁵³

The communication routes were on the inner, and more easily secured, courtyard side of the house, allowing for the private chambers to be outward-looking with prospects to the garden and landscape. The network of discreet routes would also have made it possible for Cecil, and any of his spies who knew the house, to "walk invisible" from one part to another.⁵⁴

Because the public circuit was linked on the inside of the south range, it opened onto the long gallery a full room width inward from its south wall (T/142 onto T/125). This arrangement was repeated at the northern end of symmetrically-organised gallery. Nevertheless, turning right-handed out of the south range, the vista was over 100ft (30.48m) to the window in the gallery's far north wall (W/T/125/15). But the areas at either end had become semi-withdrawing alcoves in their own right. Furthermore, the western-most chambers of the matching suites of state apartments in the south and north ranges (T/118 and T/132) gave directly onto these areas, creating a similar arrangement to that of Hawthorn's plan for the east end of the gallery at Windsor. (Plan.29b)

The gallery at Burghley as the internal space above all others intended "to entertain and divert the best company",⁵⁵ offered the most flexible range of alternatives for varying degrees of privacy, while still remaining broadly within the public domain. It would have provided the ideal circumstances for the sort of see and be seen - though not necessarily heard - activity, detailed by de Vulcob. Withdrawal could be partial, into the bays or alcoves to either end, "as small withdrawing rooms to the grand tour of the house",⁵⁶ with the opportunity for further retreat into the turret and tower rooms. The queen had a keen understanding of the political wisdom of appearing to exist in the public domain. Unlike her father, she did not retreat with a small coterie of intimates behind closed doors.⁵⁷ As she declared to the Spanish ambassador, when he expressed concern over threats to her reputation for virtue, "I do not live in a corner - a thousand eyes see all I do, and calumny will not fasten on me for ever"⁵⁸

On the east side of the long gallery at Burghley the closets to either side of the central balcony overlooked the courtyard and would have doubled as ideal viewing boxes, looking, through open windows, towards its "stage" end.⁵⁹ It is a refinement of the relationship between gallery and courtyard at Nonsuch, where from the former there was an excellent view to the "Tudor-propagandist iconography" of the latter.⁶⁰ At Burghley

these intimate annexes (T/126 & T/121), which were still the through-routes to the balcony, also had backstairs access to the informal network of routes round the house (T/122 & T/129).

The quality and fashionable style of the surviving architectural wainscoting in the closets of the gate tower (124 & 127) suggests the status that was accorded to these exquisite miniature asides to the gallery. North was still advising at the end of the seventeenth century that because of its prestige, the gallery should be "either carv'd painted or set off with pictures",⁶¹ and as Thomas Cecil's letter to his father in 1578 recommended, the whole gallery was most probably "ceiled" in a similar manner to the closets.⁶² The outline of an arabesque pattern can still be detected beneath the present paintwork on several of the wainscot panels of the "Hog's Hall" (001) (Fig. 6.33a & 7.7). The disposition of the panelling here has been much altered and, it may have originally belonged elsewhere in the house.⁶³ Again the design is in a similar vein to the surviving wall paintings in the west and east ranges (Fig. 3.9) and also to similar to decoration shown in the upper compartment of architecturally organized panelling at Theobalds, suggesting that like the repertoire of motifs that feature in the architecture, Cecil also kept to a fairly unified style of wall decoration (Fig. 6.4).

Beyond the gallery the public route by-passed the first two chambers of the north range, which formed part of a virtually matching suite to that of the south range. This mirroring of apartments followed a development in royal planning established by Henry VIII towards the end of his reign, but was a more compact version of the organisation, at Hampton Court for example, where "his" and "hers" royal accommodation each had their own separate galleries.⁶⁵ At Burghley the galleries were stacked one above the other, although there is no clue as to whether either was designated as a female gallery like that for Mildred Cecil at the east end of the house in the first phase at Burghley. In the seventeenth century the plan of Robert Cecil's Hatfield was to be on the same principle as Burghley with matching, and there unequivocally royal, suites linked by a long gallery. At Audley

End the matching state suites similarly could hardly be construed as anything other than paired royal accommodation. As Drury argues this would have made them "a singularly inappropriate gesture if the throne were occupied by the ageing Virgin Queen", and most unlikely, therefore, to have been constructed before 1603.⁶⁶ At Burghley, however, the north suite was part of the private accommodation, and would not have held the same overt significance if doubling as state accommodation during a royal visit. Indeed, it is clear from the 1583 Schedule of Accommodation drawn up for the progress visit to Theobalds, that the Earl of Leicester's lodgings stood in such relationship to the queen's private suite on the upper floor. This would hardly have been accepted by the queen if such parallels were automatically inferred by these more improvised paired accommodation suites.⁶⁷ At the same time, nevertheless, the plan at Burghley made perfect provision for a future monarch with consort.

The consciousness of vista and perspectives inherent in the internal planning of the parade route as shown by Thorpe is sustained through this part of its circuit. The doorways are again enfilade along the whole distance of the range to the Chapel Chamber (T/101). Drury suggests that the Jacobean layout of the first floor at Audley End was probably "one of the earliest coherent examples of such planning in England".⁶⁸ But the repeated use of aligned openings, as shown on Thorpe's first floor plan of Burghley, suggests an acute awareness of the dramatic visual impact that could be created by this simple architectural device. The effect serves to entice the viewer forward, and would have acted as a natural directional guide around the house (Fig 7.8).⁶⁹ Enfilade doorways are also a feature of Hawthorn's 1572 plan for the Inner Court at Theobalds, (for which there are no other first-floor plans) suggesting that Cecil may have introduced the same novel arrangement in both houses (Plan 19).

The chapel was the final public-cum-private chamber, completing the circle of the parade route. It would only have been large enough to hold the queen and her personal entourage and the most senior members of the court, but there was provision for the pomp

of the procession to the chapel to take place in full view of the courtyard. This ceremony was an important part of the daily timetable of court rituals. Hentzner gives a good description of the full ceremonial spectacle adhered to at Greenwich during the summer visit in 1598.⁷⁰ At Burghley the route from presence chamber to chapel lay across the lead walk at the eastern end of the courtyard passing under the central archway of the clock-tower frontispiece. The ceremony would have provided a tableau at first-floor level moving across the 'stage' at the east end of the courtyard, in a similar manner to the scenes envisaged by Veronese.⁷¹

Meanwhile, if not proceeding to the chapel from the northern side of the house, the Roman stair was the closure of the first-floor circuit, and the opening, in the form of a distended triumphal arch, of the grand route to the climax of the roofscape (T/136). Waldstein's description confirms the roof's function as "a promenade or gallery, with a leaden floor, from which you get a most beautiful view."⁷² He admired a similar feature at Theobalds where, "upon the roof of the house there is a splendid gallery from which you can see the Tower of London."⁷³ The benefit of "Good ayre" surrounding the well-sited house, which according to Boorde, "doth conserve the lyfe of man, it doth comfort the brayne, And the powers naturall, anymall, and spyrytuall",⁷⁴ could be enjoyed not only in the gardens and park, but at its most bracing on the roof. The queen herself liked to "get up a heat"⁷⁵ by vigorous walking in the open air, again a practice recommended by Boorde as a good habit before going to prayers: "moderately exercyse your body with some labour, or playing at tennys, or castyng a bowle or paysyng wayghtes or plomettes of ledde in your handes...to open your poores, and to augmente naturall hete"⁷⁶

The roofs themselves are laid out as clear promenades, with steps leading up to the higher roof levels at each corner of the house. These were bounded by balustrades on either side, across the width of the north and south ranges at either end (Fig 7.9), reiterating the format of garden terraces below, as shown on Caldwell's engraving (Fig A.4). The iconography of the house - literally meaning the "footprint" of its plan - could be measured

underfoot as the roof was circuited. To either side, the route was bordered by the elaborate architectural screen of the "vamure" with its "cuppes"⁷⁷ and obelisks and open arched aedicules. On the calculated roof levels of the late sixteenth century, these open arches would have made a series of natural frames at eye-level through which to view events in the courtyard looking inwards, and the panoramic landscape looking outwards. Like the view from the hilltop Arcadian lodge described by Sidney, the eye had "lordship over a good large circuit" which was so framed as to appear like a landscape painting, as if "a pleasant picture of nature, with lovely lightsomnes and artificial shadows"(Fig. 7.9 & 7.10).⁷⁸

From the gable window that opened onto the broad walk-way at the southern end of the great hall, there would also have been a superb view of the hall roof timbers (Fig 7.11). Like these, the decorative repertoire of forms on the roof provides clear reference points to the architectural theme running throughout the whole house. The square and cipher motif, picked up on the crested balustrades of the north and south pavilions, also leads all the way to the top on the vault of the Roman stair ((Fig 7.10 & 6.23b). The Cecil arms, and garb crests held aloft by their lion supporters, which stand atop these balustrades, echo the full achievement with its silhouetted lion supporters on the clock-tower. (Fig 5.6) ⁷⁹

Tower rooms and turrets, the ideal *tête-à-tête* banqueting houses or "cuppolo clossets" as North dubbed them,⁸⁰ also echoed the sociable combination of intimate spaces leading off the main parade route of the *piano nobile* below. The prospect room which, with its balustraded roof top with corner cupolas, allowed for larger gatherings and would have been an ideal hunting view or shelter complete with chimneypiece against the vagaries of English weather.

Overall, the architectural panorama of the roofscape is playfully resonant of the roofless remains of the classical past. Such scenes were becoming familiar to the elite circles of the sixteenth-century court, as fashionable tourist sites for travellers on the Continent, and more widely at second-hand through printed illustrations. The great

obelisk tower and clock face forming its pediment beneath, are experienced from the roof as though at ground level, as part of the "architectural furniture" recognizable from these sources. Serlio's classical scena tragica for instance, shows no less than four obelisks in the background (Fig 7. 12), while one of the illustrations (f. Mij) in Cousin's De Perspective which Throckmorton supplied to Cecil in 1561, is of a classical ruin set in a landscape and featuring an obelisk.

Above all, it is the various groups of chimneys "of quarried stone shaped like columns" as Waldstein described them, which evoke the scene of roofless antique remains.⁸¹ The "columns" with their full entablatures are of the Tuscan design like those of the courtyard, and equally correct for the 'ground' floor of this new order of architecture. They provide a fittingly witty and sophisticated variation on the theme of the more constrained disciplines of decorum required below.⁸² There would have been no pollution from the "chimneys in summer" which Cecil thought to be as redundant as "soldiers in peace",⁸³ but which now had a new role as features in this ideal recreational pleasure ground.

The roof epitomized the new concept of luxury hospitality. It is the climax of the 'urbs in rure' of the interior civilization of the house, which moved further away from the vernacular traditions, embodied by the great hall, as the route circuited upwards. Visual contact was maintained with the wider surrounding environment throughout, but physically and culturally that environment became increasingly distant.

CONCLUSION

On the evidence of new material and new readings of material already treated elsewhere, the thesis has argued for a re-evaluation of Burghley. It is interpreted as a more significant and original house than it has customarily been regarded as, when considered both as an architectural and as a socio-political structure and environment. It has been possible to construct a much clearer idea of the nature of the first building phase in which indications of important cultural as well as stylistic changes were already inherent. As a result of this new research the earlier building has been analysed as the initial stage of a fundamentally single-minded project in which the second building phase is seen as a radical advancement, but not a contradiction, of earlier ideas. This in turn identifies Burghley as the house in which new concepts, subsequently developed by Cecil and his influential circle, first appear. More importantly, these new concepts mark a seminal point in the evolution of the function and meaning of 'the country house'. This is supported by evidence available from the early period as to the pattern of the Cecils' private life which also provides valuable clues to the manner in which the building is understood.

Indications that this private life was more family-centred and organised within a less predominantly male and male-dominated domestic environment than the model of great households in previous periods is an important case in point. As discussed in Chapters One and Two, Mildred Cecil's role was central to the intellectual, as well as the domestic life, of the Cecil households. Not only did she play a part in aspects of political and diplomatic affairs, she exercised a strong influence over her husband in their private life. The expansion of the independent female accommodation assigned to her, to include its own gallery and adjacent nursery wing, reflects this status within the household, even if it may also have defined the limits of her complete freedom of access in the house. Its aggrandisement through the inclusion of a gallery takes its lead from royal precedents, not from great private households. The creation of a well-appointed guest-lodging block,

integrated into the main body of the house also suggests provision for the introduction of new and less male-orientated social patterns which did not merely mimic those of great households of previous generations. The range would have afforded ideal accommodation for the sort of house parties the Cecils were invited to by Philip Hoby in 1557 when he wrote to Cecil on several occasions. In November, for instance, he was urged to join Hoby, the Mildmays and the Masons at Bisham, to "be there this Christmas and bring my lady with you to make merry" and, as mentioned above, to "desire my Lady to come and bring Tannikyn with her; and I hope so to provide for her and her nurse as all the house shall be merry, and she notwithstanding at her own ease and quiet".⁸⁴ The previous year George, Lord Cobham had written in a similar vein prompting Cecil to come to his house for Christmas.⁸⁵ These letters, like the prolonged visit of the Thomas Hobys to Burghley for the summer of 1558, indicate a very different cultural background from that of the creators and inhabitants of earlier great houses and castles.

As Heal has established, the hospitality of the magnates of the fifteenth century and during Henry VIII's reign rarely included the entertainment of their peers, unless it was while at court in London.⁸⁶ In the country, the duties of entertaining socially inferior dependants and supporters in the locality together with part-business part-social gatherings of advisers and officers formed the dominant patterns of hospitality.⁸⁷ By contrast, the evidence of the Cecils giving and receiving of hospitality amongst peer groups of friends on the basis of pleasure and entertainment, rather than social obligation to inferiors or strangers is, as one might expect, much closer to the customs of a minor gentry family in the first half of the sixteenth century, again as detailed by Heal.⁸⁸

The idea of a house which followed royal precedence in planning, in amenities for courtly pleasures, and, increasingly, in scale, combined with social habits which derived from the lower rather than the upper end of the power hierarchy was something quite new. The hospitality expected on Elizabeth's progress visits was itself more akin to the gentry, rather than the high aristocratic, pattern, but similarly translated onto the grandest scale.

Mildred Cecil's educational background and intellectual interests were almost identical to those of the monarch, who was tutored by her father. The queen was far more interested in the company of her courtiers than that of their wives, but the amenities of a house in which Mildred's high status was signalled by her accommodation, and in which she obviously had influence over the management and organisation of the household, would no doubt have been well suited to the needs and taste of Elizabeth and her own, predominantly female, immediate household.

Unlike Wolsey's great palaces, Theobalds and Burghley were not set up as rival courts to those of the monarch by an 'alter rex'. In a more politically astute arrangement they were proffered as courts-in-waiting for the use and entertainment of the sovereign herself. Henry VIII made frequent visits to the great houses of a number of his courtiers, but his progresses tended to be more exclusively recreational, less formal and less public than those of Elizabeth.⁸⁹ Hunting parties, which were usually the reason for such excursions, particularly in the latter part of the reign, tended to be predominantly masculine affairs.⁹⁰ A property like Acton Court might be splendidly decorated in the latest court style by a courtier for a visit from the king and his new queen,⁹¹ but whether churchman or courtier, to build a house that was too well suited to accommodate monarch and court was a politically dangerous move in Henry's reign.⁹²

The architecture and plan of Burghley draw on aspects of earlier great houses that were sometimes used for political entertaining, just as they do on aspects of royal palace building. Overall, however, the house constitutes a new departure in conscious planning for its intended role. Burghley can be identified, not as a conservative building marking the last flowering of the medieval courtyard house, but as a first generation of houses self-consciously designed with the entertainment of the corporate body of the queen and court as a principal function in mind, at a time when hospitality as a mechanism of political and diplomatic power-broking was reaching a peak. At the same time, however, signs of this new purpose and style are carefully couched within a familiar frame.

In hindsight, it is easy to underestimate the impact which these changes in social customs appear to have had at the time. In Elizabethan England the politics of hospitality were as complex as the politics of architecture. Aspects of both had become closely linked as morally contentious issues. 'Modern' classical architecture, huge scale and costly materials were presented in popular and polemic literature as showy manifestations of conspicuous consumption that replaced the traditional social obligations of hospitality with material values which fed nothing but the eye. Both Harrison and Camden referred to the new standards of grandeur and luxury, even at relatively modest levels of society, as perceived in such terms.⁹³ The 1580s, which immediately followed a peak in lavish progress entertainments, have been identified as the period when concern and comment regarding the concept of hospitality noticeably increased in many genres of literature by comparison with the previous years of the century.⁹⁴ The new style of architecture was frequently employed as a metaphor for what was seen as the pride, self-interest and remote lack of concern for local communities on the part of the new breed of landowners. It was a potent variation of the stereotypical moral theme in which the dialectics were frequently adapted directly from examples in classical texts. Together with the Renaissance of classical architecture came a ready-made critique.⁹⁵

The great hall, where the fruits of the rural microcosm were consumed collectively in the company of the master of the house, was portrayed as the heart of the idealized system of harmony and productivity. Forsaking this common dining place was the first sign of its breakdown. Already in the fourteenth century reference is made to this in the much-quoted passage in *Piers Plowman*.⁹⁶ In the middle of the seventeenth century John Selden was still writing in a similar vein: "the Hall was the place where the great Lord us'd to eat...Where he saw all his servants and Tenants about him. He eat not in private....when once he became a thing Coopt up, all his greatness was spoil'd."⁹⁷ Desertion of the house altogether, signalled by smokeless chimneys, was the final result of

this abdication from the duties of honour by remote town-dwelling owners, "where many good husbandmen dwelt, there is now nothing left but a great house without a fire."⁹⁸

At close range, out of commission and to the right audience, the chimney "columns" at Burghley were part of the cultivated architectural scenery, their conversion to a prosaic practical purpose, which at the same time subverted the solid load-bearing identity of the column into a hollow tube, adds a sophisticated zest to the conceit. But this spectacle reads very differently from the perspective of the 'other', outside. Looking from the ground, the roofscape as pleasure-ground is hidden. The columns register as chimneys, doubly so if they are in use, in their expected position. The "economy of vision" which comes into play where the objects encountered conform to anticipated norms takes them as read. The perceptual faculties concentrate the human focus instead on discerning the unfamiliar and unexpected.⁹⁹ Waldstein went on the roof, and his perception, like ours, would have been altered by the apprehension of the chimneys as columns. Without this fore-knowledge, the normally contradictory objects, which have become one in the same structure, are differently understood from the context, both visual and cultural, within which they are encountered.

How consciously the double meaning of the chimney columns was taken into account at Burghley we cannot know. What one can be reasonably certain of is that they were not raised as an antagonistic or insensitive gesture towards the local community that was socially and politically so important to Cecil. Unlike Hatton, a man of considerably less subtle intellect, Cecil did not choose to build a gargantuan palace modelled on Theobalds in the Northamptonshire countryside. When he was defending himself from attack for the magnificence of his "palaces", Cecil identified different rationales for each of his houses.¹⁰⁰ It is reasonable to assume from the evidence available that he considered Theobalds and Burghley to be subject to different decorums, "the arrangement of things in appropriate and suitable places", as Cicero defined the Stoics concept of the Greek *eukairia* "in which... the 'place' of an action is the opportuneness of the occasion."¹⁰¹ Unlike

Holdenby, and Kirby after Hatton took it over, Cecil did not allow Burghley to remain unoccupied, but installed his heir and wife, and their soon rapidly expanding family, whose principal residence it became.¹⁰² Numbers of the chimneys, superbly engineered for their function, would therefore have been in use except in the summer progress season. Cecil maintained the custom of keeping an open table for distinguished visitors at Theobalds at all times.¹⁰³ In 1578 Thomas wrote anxiously to his father "I beseech your Lordship excuse me towards my Lord Howard for the simple entertainment he found at Burghley being my wife nor myself at home",¹⁰⁴ so patently Cecil was expecting his son to do the same on his behalf at Burghley, mindful no doubt of Cicero's warning in De Officiis:

"...a grand dwelling can, if there is emptiness there, often bring disgrace upon its master, and very much so if once upon a time, with a different master, it had usually been thronging with people. It is indeed unpleasant when passers by can say: Ancient house, you are governed, alas, by a master who is not your equal"¹⁰⁵

In sixteenth and early seventeenth-century England, classical columns and chimneys were cited as the totems of what were seen as opposing value systems. Working chimneys became ideal metaphors for true hospitality.¹⁰⁶ The message conveyed by their smoke signals was one of reassurance that inside "fires shine bright on every hearth", continually in readiness for strangers of all degrees, great and small "to warm their welcome here."¹⁰⁷ By early in the seventeenth century, Jonson was contrasting the idealized hospitality intimated by these physical comforts with the "envious show" denoted by precious materials and "polish'd pillars".¹⁰⁸ Joseph Hall, in his earlier anti-pastoral, published in 1597-8, employed an imaginary county, the familiar unit of social geography, as the vehicle to underline the new anti-social trends where "Hous-keeping's dead". In its place

"There findest thou some stately *Dorick* frame
 Or neate *Ionicke* work;
 Like the vaine bubble of *Iberian* pride."¹⁰⁹

This alienating spectacle is one of emptiness and human neglect: "the marble pavement hid with desert weede"¹¹⁰. The traditional emblems of hospitality have been subverted into tokens of its denial:

Looke to the towred chymneis which should be
 The wind-pipes of good hospitalitie,
 Through which it breatheth to the open ayre,
 Betokening life and liberall welfaire
 Lo, there th'unthankfull swallow takes her rest,
 and fils the Tonell with her circled nest"¹¹¹

Classical architecture is not identified with the positive moral values with which it has been so regularly presented as being 'naturally' and universally invested. It is seen as vainglorious, 'foreign', symbolic of a culture where material values have transcended human values.

One of the political skills which Cecil appears to have been consciously practising at Burghley was to maintain the image of honour associated with the social responsibility of traditional hospitality, but to transform its meaning to new codes of conduct. The obligations of the former were to keep one's house in constant readiness to entertain strangers of every degree, offering open hospitality without selection. As Hamlet instructs Polonius, the travelling players are to be used "after your own honour and dignity/the less they deserve, the more merit is in your bounty."¹¹² This ethic had been re-cast as irresponsible liberality by Cecil in his precepts to Robert. Undeserving behaviour is not to be tolerated: "...some consume themselves through secret vices and their hospitality must

bear the blame. Banish swinish drunkards out of thy house."¹¹³ Peer groups could expect generous hospitality, but not casual wastrels of other degrees. In the new interpretation 'Good-housekeeping' takes on the modern meaning of sound economic management as an end in itself. The 'new' concept of hospitality as practised by Cecil increasingly became a key element in the persuasive repertoire of political life, a public activity consciously directed and offered for specific personal and supra-personal ends. This self-interested 'modernity' which is so evident throughout Cecil's precepts for Robert can, like so many aspects of his personal and wider political methodology, be traced to Cicero's Officiis:

"Again, hospitality was rightly praised by Theophrastus. for it is most seemly ... for the homes of distinguished men to be open to distinguished guests. Furthermore, it reflects splendidly on the republic that foreigners do not in our city go short of that kind of liberality. For those who wish to possess great power honourably, it is also extremely beneficial to wield influence and command gratitude among foreign peoples through the guests one has entertained"¹¹⁴

Cecil exploited Theobalds and Cecil House with consummate success to this end in his political strategy to advertise and promote the interests of the nation, the queen and the Cecils. At Burghley there were similar intentions, but these were also part of a more intricate layering of overlapping purposes. Here it was the public image of the more private empire, carefully integrated into a schema addressed to the queen, that was declared and promoted. In the same manner that Castiglione's Renaissance courtier was a composite of the ideals of the Roman patrician and the Christian knight, so the architecture and iconography of Burghley took advantage of the heritage of both traditions, and associated them to its eponymous master, his monarch and his native country. The theme of the Golden Age of English hospitality and of the chivalry associated with the ancient Order of the Garter was conjoined with that of the return of the Golden Age of classical

civilisation restored to England by Elizabeth "that hope of Troy" who heralded the "Golden Age again/Religion, ease and wealth of former world."¹¹⁵

The insider stepped into a grand classical scene, proclaiming, in its architecture and in the imperial theme of its iconography, an antique heritage equal to that of England's European rivals. The privileged were addressed as a well-educated audience. The architecture drew upon that of the Roman theatre and the orator's platform, re-interpreted for the presentational needs of monarch and principal minister to a sixteenth-century court.

On proceeding to the interior, the great hall, the kitchen and the "open buttery"¹¹⁶ affirmed the traditional 'English' values of communal hospitality. The Garter theme celebrated the host's membership of what was proclaimed to be the oldest and highest order of chivalry in Europe.¹¹⁷ The plan was organised to allow for the smooth operation and subtle control of both the formal and the informal programme of the court, while still catering for fittingly imposing, but compact accommodation for the family when the public part of the house was not in use. The roofs, loggias, formal gardens and hunting park provided a variety of environments for less constrained social activity and the vigorous outdoor exertion of the elite sports essential to entertain, exercise and impress the monarch and the court.

The architecture and surroundings spoke eloquently of Cecil's achievements, his power and his wealth, but these were carefully allied to institutions of state and of honours conferred by the monarch. His academic interests, not just in architecture, but in history, genealogy, antiquity, classical literature, rhetoric, horticulture and ceremonial were all brought into play.

The principal questions on which the research has been focussed have been as follows. What was Burghley? What purposes was it intended to serve, what audiences to address, and thus, what meanings to convey through its architecture and surroundings -

both symbolically and as a phenomenon? In what manner, therefore, do its architectural style, form and plan relate to these issues and what was the relationship between patron and building? Family home, working estate, dynastic flagship, court-in-waiting - Burghley emerges as a complex architectural and political entity in which the surrounding garden and estate also played a significant role. Whatever the contribution made by architect-designers, including those from the experienced offices of the Royal Works, the evidence points to Cecil as the principal controlling intelligence behind the project from beginning to end of the building period.

The architectural language of Burghley is the language of politics, the language of rhetoric, to which the language of classical architecture - the principles of which themselves rely heavily on rhetorical theory - is appropriated. While the 'letter' of classical architecture may not always be adhered to, the 'spirit' is clearly understood. Ideas of order, unity and clarity extend beyond an outer wrapping into the internal organisation of the building and to its relationship with the exterior. The decorum of the orders and their attendant architectural repertoire is not violated. The orders are used as an organisational as well as a decorative system, but features from outside the classical oeuvre which are appropriate to climate and function, such as bay windows, are included. The aesthetic principles are an integral part of a human theatre as much as of a standing monument. Classical architecture provided an ideal model, rather than a rigid pattern, for both purposes.

As outlined in the introduction and discussed throughout the thesis, the building incorporated some major innovations within the context of English architecture, several of which presage important later developments. The loggias, the staircases, the development of the long gallery plan, the symmetry of the interior layout, the creation of perspective vistas, the concept of garden and house developed in relation to one another, are amongst the most significant. Burghley's persuasive style was addressed to three audiences which represented the three separate but interconnected power bases of Cecil's ambitions. The

corporate body of queen and court; the local society of his "native" county (embracing the immediate community which was heavily dependent upon Cecil's patronage) and, ultimately, posterity.

Cecil was already expressing his ambitions as directed towards the first audience for Burghley in 1566: "God send me my heart's desire which is, regardless of cost, to have her Majesty see my good will in my service, and all others to find no lack of good cheer."¹¹⁸ For the second and third, "in my native county where also my livelihood resteth", Cecil claimed he had no equal "for government and for country liking."¹¹⁹ Northamptonshire was "where my principal house is and my name and posterity are to remain at God's will and where I am no new planted or new feathered gentleman."¹²⁰ Walsingham's reply to Cecil's plea for his right to be appointed Lord Lieutenant of Lincolnshire in 1587 serves as a good example of the role the house played in the interaction between Cecil's local and national power bases: "It were a great wrong unto your Lordship, having your chief house in that county, that either he [the Earl of Lincoln] or any other should be preferred before your Lordship."¹²¹

In the longer term, the aim was that which Alberti defined as a fundamental purpose for building :

"all agree that we should endeavour to leave a Reputation behind us, not only for our Wisdom but our Power too; for this Reason, as Thucydides observes, we erect great Structures, that our Posterity may suppose us to have been great persons. When therefore we adorn our Habitations not more for Delicacy than to procure Honour to our Country and our Families, who can deny this to be a Work well becoming the wisest Men?"¹²²

The process was already being verbally massaged by Cecil's household biographer in the early seventeenth century, describing his houses as:

"all bewtiful uniform necessary and well-seated which besides all those before and hereafter mentioned are great arguments of his Wisdom and Judgment".¹²³

The message to be conveyed to all three audiences was fundamentally the same, but the decorum of oratory adopted was carefully modulated to the persuasive style suited to the particular 'live' audience to which it was addressed.

Undoubtedly, Burghley would have been a very different structure had Cecil employed a major architect from the Continent, or had such a figure, as Inigo Jones was to be, emerged in England in the second half of the sixteenth century. While, like the House of Kalender in Sidney's *Arcadia*, Burghley might have been built with "the lights doors and stairs rather directed to the use of the guest than the eye of the artificer", similarly one can confidently say of it "the one chiefly heeded, so the other not neglected."¹²⁴ In the "eye" of the patron, satisfying the eye - and the mind - of the guest was an integral essential of its use. The underlying logic and unity of the architectural plan, of its three-dimensional form, and of the space it enclosed, was fundamental to the purpose of the house, physically, symbolically and aesthetically. To work politically, the architecture had to be convincing both in form and content. It had to appear authoritative to a cosmopolitan audience, many of whom would have been able to make first-hand comparisons with the most up-to-date buildings on the Continent.

Although not entirely realized, the ambition of the architectural rationale was not something confined to a visual aesthetic of surface, the "beautiful shell" of its outward form.¹²⁵ Full advantage was taken of the opportunities for differentiated architecture unique to the courtyard plan. Nevertheless, while the dominant visual impression of exterior and interior fronts was subtly different, it was not unrelated. The richly articulated classical architecture of the courtyard was also the basis of the bone structure which

determined the fundamental proportions of the exoskeleton. The space enclosed between the two was similarly part of this syncretic system.

In the long-term, whether Burghley is interpreted as "a noble pile"¹²⁶ or a "proud ambitious heap"¹²⁷ depends largely upon the political persuasion and cultural conditioning of the observers, and the persuasive power of the strongest rhetorical or ideological influence over them. It is not dependent upon inherent moral principles enshrined in its architectural form. The semiotic power of the great hall, for example, is experienced differently as conscious historical understanding and as an instinctive response to a familiar structure.

Aesthetic value is similarly unstable. Looked at with the "eye of the artificer",¹²⁸ the limitations and noticeable faults on the surface of the architectural form at Burghley may blind the observer to other properties which a closer investigation reveals. Taken in isolation these anomalies can, and have been interpreted as obvious manifestations of ignorance or an immature understanding of principles applied to architectural form. From this process, an overall profile is inferred. Professional interest and professional conditioning tend to a prejudice against 'amateur' patron-led architecture, where the professionals appear to be in a subordinate role. The "utterly incongruous English mullioned and transomed bay window"¹²⁹ on the clock-tower frontispiece at Burghley as described by Pevsner is explained as a typical result of the diffuse architectural control and undisciplined openness to the influence of disparate styles that is regarded as inherent in the architectural process as operated by Cecil. What Pevsner cannot explain is why what he describes as "this happy-go-lucky mixing up of foreign phrases with the English vernacular (the chimney stacks are coupled Tuscan Doric columns complete with entablatures) does not appear disjointed,"¹³⁰ and can only account for it by the formidable zeitgeist of the Elizabethan age.

Whatever else was the cause of Burghley's architectural form, Cecil's building, like the products of any of his endeavours, was not a happy-go-lucky affair. The bay window is indeed incongruous, in that in all other respects the architecture of the courtyard was of a remarkably homogeneous and unified French-inspired classical Renaissance style.

Overall, a closer analysis of the final form of Burghley by the end of Cecil's lifetime shows it to be a much more ordered and thoughtfully Vitruvian product. Born of reflection, "careful and laborious thought" and of "watchful attention directed to the agreeable effect of one's plan" and invention, "the solving of intricate problems" and occasionally perhaps bordering on "the discovery of new principles by means of brilliancy and versatility",¹³¹ rather than of energy over reason.

Viewed from the outside as an autonomous abstract structure, Burghley is an exciting building, but not a model architectural form. Viewed less superficially, taking the courtyard architecture, the lucid interior plan, and the relationship between part to part and part to whole of the complete architectural entity, it is both a much more interesting and much more complex phenomenon, visually and intellectually. The emphasis is on a building as it was intended to be experienced, in which the architecture is completed and enhanced by the human presence, and the human presence enhanced by the architecture. From this perspective, Burghley is also far more recognisably the product of an immensely shrewd, calculating and able politician who was a statesman of international standing operating in a European context. It is the product of a man who undoubtedly took great intellectual pleasure in building and who directed his broad-ranging architectural experience, as well as his political acumen, into its design. It was an understandable focus of effort, sustained over a period of more than thirty years. The end product was the creation of the building that was essential in the short-term to the creation of Cecil's own identity. In the long-term it was essential to achieving his greatest ambition, for an earthly immortality by creating the dynasty of which it was, and continues to be, the most potent and indestructible material and symbolic expression.

As a postscript to Cecil's building of Burghley one can look to events beyond his own lifetime. While Theobalds was a tremendous contemporary success on the national scene, Burghley remained, as far as is known, unvisited by queen and court. Its strategic position, suggested by Northumberland's visit in 1552, came into play once more, however, in the arrangements made for King James' progress from Scotland to take up the throne of England in 1603. The Privy Council, no doubt at Robert Cecil's behest, had planned to greet James officially at Burghley where he was to be furnished with all the official regalia of state, before proceeding, not to London, but first to Theobalds, where he and his court from Scotland were lavishly entertained by Robert Cecil for several days before progressing to the capital.¹³² On 6th April James wrote to the Council in London informing them that the regalia was to be sent to York, whence he had decided to make a diversion.¹³³ James appears to have been attempting to assert his independence of the established power network and assured the Council that they need not trouble to meet him in York. The Cecils' infrastructure, however, was too strong. Thomas Cecil (now Lord Burghley), as President of the Council of the North, was honour-bound to greet his future sovereign in the city of York which was its headquarters. He immediately posted there and, acting as host, laid on liberal hospitality for the king and his train. From York the progress was via a number of the great houses of England. At the bridge at Stamford, marking the border between Lincolnshire and Northamptonshire, James was again met in great state by Thomas Cecil:

"bravely accompanied, and gallantly appointed with men and horse who received his Majestie and attended him to Burleigh where his highness with all his traine were received with great magnificence, the house seeming so rich, as if it had been furnished at the charges of an Emperour. Well, it was all too litle, his Majestie being worthy much more, being now the greatest Christian Monarke of himself absolute."¹³⁴

By the time he reached London via Theobalds, the "Greatest Christian monarke of himself absolute" can have been in little doubt as to where a great deal of the power within his new kingdom was vested.

While the architecture and iconography of Burghley was strongly nationalistic, it was not provincial in spirit, either in time or place. The rhetoric of its form and its imagery was as appropriate to the new monarch in 1603 as it was to his predecessor. When Queen Victoria visited some two-hundred and forty years later for the christening of Lady Victoria Cecil in 1844, the great hall was brought into service for an enormous banquet.¹³⁵ The Garter theme of the state rooms, if still extant, would have been as relevant as it was in the sixteenth century. The imperial theme of the courtyard, although by that time largely subsumed by subsequent alterations, would have been even more apposite to the Queen Empress, who by 1897 was to be ruler of the largest Empire known to history, than it was for Queen Elizabeth I.

If one doubts the potential value of the whole country house environment and attendant package of amenities as a vehicle for power politics as they were consciously conceived by Cecil, one can look to the twentieth century for confirmation of its success as a topos. Valid analogies can be made between the structure and the logistics of the plan of Burghley and its surroundings, and the blueprints set out in standard planning manuals - today's pattern books - for architects involved in the booming late-twentieth-century global phenomenon that is the conference centre or conference "resort" hotel. The specifications place considerable emphasis on architectural planning intended to organise and encourage particular patterns of human behaviour on the part of the users of these complexes, which - like Burghley - are designed as environments for the exercise and demonstration of power through entertainment, meetings and promotional activity on the part of specific corporate groups, in these cases, for either political or commercial ends.

These rather less aristocratic off-spring of the stately homes of England have not only played a significant role in the survival of numbers of their progenitors, they have proved to be hugely successful for the exercise and promotion of political and commercial interests. Golf now takes the place of hunting, and indeed, many former deer parks, including part of that at Burghley, have been turned into golf courses. Burghley was planned and designed to facilitate the smooth running of the hospitality offered to monarch and court and to maximise the opportunities presented by such occasions. In this context, it can be looked upon as something other than a heritage object, a "monument to past opportunity"¹³⁶ that is part of a closed history, disconnected from contemporary institutions and the organs of power as they operate today.¹³⁷ An analogy between the use made of Theobalds in the sixteenth century and that of Broom's Barn at the end of the twentieth for hosting major diplomatic occasions has been noted above.¹³⁸ While not suggesting that the aim of the example given below, to launch a new model of car, is analogous to that of Elizabethan progress events, the similarities in the methods employed, relative to its respective period, are worth noting.

In 1983 Ford launched their Orion car in the UK at an undisclosed but substantial cost. The company took over Castle Ashby in Northamptonshire (home of Cecil's close neighbours, the Compton family, in the sixteenth century and now a prestigious conference centre). They built a complete banqueting hall, fully disguised as part of the house, in which they hosted a grand gala dinner for their network of dealers specially transported from all over Europe. At the end of the dinner, to the complete surprise of the guests, the main wall was as though magically lifted away.¹³⁹ As it disappeared, the Orion emerged on a revolving platform from out of the floor and a vast circular screen, 90 foot across appeared in the distance. The screen showed footage of the car in action filmed in the surroundings of Castle Ashby while a laser-beam light show set to the music of the London symphony orchestra played over the same 'real' landscape about the screen. "The boy who opened the gates in the film was the same boy who had opened the gates to let the delegates into the castle grounds that afternoon." The launch was a huge success and a standing

ovation could not be heard for the sound of the firework display which followed.¹⁴⁰ The car was launched as Orion.

In the culture of the twentieth century there may be no immediate recognition that the Orion takes its name from the giant-hunter of Greek mythology, lover of the Goddess Aurora, immortalized as a constellation after his death.

The past may be "a foreign country" where things are done differently.¹⁴¹ But, by comparison with this example, the notion of using a Northamptonshire country house as a locus for promoting the Queen of England as Astrea, the fulfilment of Virgil's prophecy, together with her chief minister, the descendants of Aeneas, appears as a powerful political device of a far less remote and fantastic culture.

-
- 1 Starkey Ed. 1987, 2
 - 2 Starkey Ed. 1987 and Thurley 1993. Thurley, however has surprisingly little on the wider administration and government functions of the palaces, beyond those of the court itself.
 - 3 See Chapter 1
 - 4 See Sharpe & Lake Eds. 1994, 1-44 and Starkey Ed. 1987 (throughout) on the difference in styles of regimes. For Cecil's involvement in the changes at Whitehall/Westminster see Chapter 1, and see King's Works Vol 3, 78 where Summerson observes "one is inclined to associate the work here [at Whitehall] with what was going on at Westminster and to see it as the result of a broad decision to rehabilitate and improve the whole metropolitan setting of the queen and her administration"
 - 5 See for example Rye 104-106 and Sharpe & Lake Eds. 1994, 1-40
 - 6 The Records of the Acts of the Privy Council are missing from 31 Dec 1565 to 8 Oct 1566, but on the progress of 1578, for instance, the council met almost daily (Dovey 1996, 107)
 - 7 PRO 31/3/26 Baschet transcripts, J de Vulcob to Bochetel, 6 August 1566, f.132-145
 - 8 The house was substantial and was no doubt already prepared as an overflow from Burghley for senior members of the court (see chapter 3)
 - 9 PRO 31/3/26 Baschet transcripts, J de Vulcob to Bochetel, 6 August 1566, f. 133
 - 10 See, for example, the refusal of access to the queen's apartments to one of Leicester's clients. (P Wright in Starkey 1987, 160)
 - 11 Puttenham claimed that "her Maiestie hath bene knowne oftentimes to mislike the superfluous expense of her subjects bestowed upon her in times of her progresses" (Puttenham iii, 24 (Ed Arber, 301) cited in Chambers 1923, Vol I, 115 fn3), although Puttenham gives no examples as evidence.
 - 12 PRO 31/3/26 Baschet transcripts, J de Vulcob to Bochetel, 6 August 1566, f.143
 - 13 PRO 31/3/26 Baschet transcripts, J de Vulcob to Bochetel, 6 August 1566, f.144
 - 14 Sharpe in Starkey Ed. 1987, 248 Sharpe is referring to the situation in Charles I's reign, but as Starkey points out he is referring to a constant of monarchical government and the patronage system (Starkey Ed. 1987, 13)
 - 15 Spenser Prothalamion (1596) Eds Smith & de Selicourt 1991, 90
 - 16 SP Ireland 63/27/35 cited in Read 1955, 436
 - 17 PRO 31/3/26 Baschet transcripts, J de Vulcob to Bochetel, 6 August 1566, f. 144-145
 - 18 Beckingsale 1967, 276
 - 19 North, Eds. Colvin & Newman 1987, 136
 - 20 Bacon Ed. Hawkins 1972, 135
 - 21 Boucher 1994, 80
 - 22 See also Chambers 1961 Vol I, 108 for comments on royal accommodation during progresses
 - 23 Alberti Bk IX ch iii, Ed. Leoni 1755, 190
 - 24 Waldstein f.150 Ed. Groos 1981, 113
 - 25 BL Cotton MSS Titus B xiii, f.173
 - 26 This would have been a familiar routine for the court, as the guard chamber was still a main area of assembly at most of the royal palaces (Baillie 1967, 173)
 - 27 Drury 1980, 10
 - 28 See Cecil's remark regarding Holdenby in his letter to Hatton in 1579 (T. Wright, 1838 Vol 2, 98)

-
- 29 Waldstein f.159 Ed. Groos 1981, 113 (cited in Girouard 1992, 60)
- 30 Castiglione, Trans. Bull 1987, 208-209. Castiglione came to England in 1506 to take part in the Garter ceremonies on behalf of Duke Guidobaldo of Urbino who had recently been made a KG (Starkey 1982, 233)
- 31 This can still be seen in the disposition of the suite of reception rooms at St James Palace, for instance. Cecil had a canopy of state on a frame constructed at Theobalds in 1585 (Hatfield MSS 143/59) and that from Kimberley Hall, made for the queen's progress visit in 1578, is now in the Burrell Collection
- 32 North Eds. Colvin & Newman 1981, 123
- 33 Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Kassel, illustrated in Thurley 1993, 222
- 34 While first floor open galleries feature in royal palaces in the sixteenth century and before, there is only one mention of a balcony dating from before the 17th century in the King's Works volumes up 1660, constructed at the tower of London for a tournament in 1501. Thurley makes no references to balconies (Thurley 1993) Inigo Jones added balconies to the royal properties of Oatlands, St James' Palace, Somerset House and the Buckingham's accommodation at Whitehall Palace (King's Works Vol 4, 216,249,262,327) and John Smythson obviously regarded them as a fashionable new feature of London Houses on his visit of 1619 (Girouard 1983, 248, 249, 262, 237)
- 35 Palladio's drawing of the elevation design for the Doge's Palace is in the Devonshire collection at Chatsworth, and illustrated in Thomson 1993, 142
- 36 Exeter MSS Special Drawer 54/5/A, 1-133. These are documents relating to Antonio Verrio's work at Burghley House. 10/16.9, 1691, Culpepper Tanner's payment to Verrio
- 37 Exeter MSS Special Drawer 54/5/A, 1-133 29/19.1, 1696/7 Culpepper Tanner's statement of account of moneys paid
- 38 Ashmole 1672, 188
- 39 This practice to be observed except in war or sickness, was instigated by Henry VII (Ashmole 1672, 234) There is a painting of the queen holding the 'George' on the ribbon round her neck as though displaying it to the viewer of the painting. This is in the Royal Collection at Windsor Castle, the seat of the Garter ceremonies (see Yates 1985 Plate 14b for illustration)
- 40 Cal SP Foreign 1547-53, 225-227 Thomas Challoner had to employ 3 clerks to copy the orders which were posted to Thomas Gresham for dispatch to Cecil
- 41 See Chapter 1
- 42 See Yates 1985, 108-9 on the significance of the Garter in the Elizabethan period and St George as "a saint who outlived the Reformation... as patron of the Order of the Garter .. he did so without a struggle" (108) For the significance of the Order having precedence over all other Orders including the Golden Fleece, (see Ashmole 1672, 189)
- 43 Read 1960, 77 and Simpson 1977, 9-10. Following the ceremony a banquet was given for the duke "which will be the greatest in remembrance", Leicester wrote to Clinton (now Earl of Lincoln) (HMC Salisbury Vol 2, No 62). Ref. to Charles IX (Yates 1985, 147) The English delegation who performed the ceremony, headed by Cecil's neighbour, Lincoln, were subsequently caught up in the terrible events of St Bartholomew's Day in France
- 44 The commission was arranged by Sir Horatio Palavicino in July 1584 through an agent, Benedetto Assarino, in Antwerp.(SP Dom 12/202/46)
- 45 Stone 1956, 187. Palavicino, the financier, who also acted as intelligence agent for Cecil, (see HMC Salisbury MSS Vol 3 no 577, 29 August 1587, for example), had taken over from Thomas Gresham, who died in 1579, as one of Cecil's chief suppliers of luxury goods from Europe. (Stone 1956, 186). The bill was made out to Thomas Cecil but Thomas sent it to his father, claiming that he would pay half

- "so as they may remain to Burghley" but pressing Cecil to pay the interest "since your house has no use of them." It is not clear what Thomas meant by this, although it suggests they may have been rejected by Cecil for adaptation to one of his other properties. It does not seem to refer to their redundancy at Burghley, for Thomas continues that they were "already made fit for the rooms here", and they would be unlikely "to get the like hangings as the times are now." (HMC Salisbury MSS Vol 3 no 575, 27th August 1587)
- 46 North Eds. Colvin & Newman 1981, 123
- 47 Waldstein f.159 Ed. Groos 1981, 113
- 48 The addition of the withdrawing chamber between privy chamber and bedchamber in the monarch's suite was not widely introduced until the beginning of the seventeenth century (Baillie 1967, 174) See also Chambers Vol 1, 108, and distribution of rooms at Theobalds, (Schedule of Accommodation 1572, HMC Salisbury MSS Vol 13, no 110). The 'closet' (T/118) does not, according to Thorpe lead directly off the 'bedchamber'. But the arrangement is similar to the gallery-and-closet plan - but here between long gallery and bedchamber - where the closet forms a buffer between the public and private rooms, (Thurley 1993, 125)
- 49 Waldstein f.159 Ed. Groos 1981, 113
- 50 Thurley 1993, 220
- 51 North Eds. Colvin & Newman 1981, 137
- 52 See Chapter 6
- 53 Nichols 1823 Vol 2, 525, BL Harleian MSS 6992, 5. Leicester may have been boasting of work he had been involved with in the refurbishment by the Royal Works completed in January 1575 under William Spicer, which included work on the gallery and the terrace. (King's Works 4, 94-95)
- 54 Francis Bacon of Cecil; that although it was his manner to try to "walk invisible", it was impossible for him to do so at court. (quoted in Beckingsale 1967, 194)
- 55 North Eds Colvin & Newman 1981, 136
- 56 North Eds Colvin & Newman 1981, 136. In the Parliamentary survey of Theobalds of 1650, PRO E317/Herts/26, 7, the bays in the long gallery are described as "three square lobbies or outlets unto square windows"
- 57 See Starkey Ed. 1993, 101-118
- 58 Queen Elizabeth to de Silva quoted in Johnson 1988, 117. The queen's treatment of the French ambassador, Fénélon, after the Massacre of St Bartholomew's in 1572, gives a clear indication of the advantages of withdrawing into the orally private, but visually public area of a window bay. The ambassador was not offered the privilege of a private audience and the members of the court who were present could observe but not hear the the whole dumb show. The court had the opportunity to register a public reprimand by greeting the ambassador in silence, but the diplomatic code was not broken by the refusal of an audience. (reports by Cecil and by Fénélon described in Read 1960, 89-90)
- 59 Von Wedel describes a similar situation where "the queen and her ladies placed themselves at the windows in a long room of Whitehall palace, near Westminster, opposite the barrier where the tournament was to be held" for the Accession Day tilt of 1584 (Von Wedel *R. Hist. Soc. Trans* ix, 258, cited Chambers Vol I, 143)
- 60 Coope 1986, 69, fn 58
- 61 North Eds Colvin & Newman 1981, 136
- 62 HMC Salisbury Vol 2, 586
- 63 HMC Salisbury Vol 2, no 586
- 64 Cecil's extreme fondness for the motif used most widely at Burghley is evident in 1584-5 when his lodgings at Greenwich were newly decorated and "his chamber

-
- was panelled in cipher and square' by Ma Hingley the chief joiner" (quoted in King's Works Vol 4, 110)
- 65 Thurley 1993, 142-143
- 66 Drury 1980, 3
- 67 Roomes and Lodgyngs in the two Courts at Theobalds 27 May 1583, printed in Hayes & Murdin 17 40-1759, (the original in Cecil's hand)
- 68 Drury 1980, 12
- 69 The effect at Burghley would not have been as dramatic as the illustration of the Paço Ducal de Vila Viçosa, Portugal, the former hunting lodge of the Dukes of Bragança (c. 1588) but the length gives some idea of the vista looking down the long gallery which was similarly lit by a series of windows on the west side (for the Paço Ducal see Worsley 1991,40-43)
- 70 Rye 1865, 104-106
- 71 See Chapter 5
- 72 Waldstein f159 Ed. Groos, 113
- 73 Waldstein f159 Ed. Groos, 113
- 74 Boorde Ch 4, Ed. Furnivall 1870, 237
- 75 Johnson 1974, 75 quoting R. Tighe & J. Davis, Annals of Windsor (London 1858) Vol 1, 639
- 76 Boorde Ch 8, Ed. Furnivall 1870, 248
- 77 Appendix A No 10
- 78 Sidney Ed. Evans 1977, 147
- 79 Some of the stonework of the balustrades and Cecilian heraldry has been replaced since the sixteenth century, but there is no reason to believe that these are not faithful replacement copies, for features vulnerable to weathering, that would have been wholly expected of the sixteenth-century house. Those of the courtyard pavilions are shown on Haynes view of 1755.
- 80 North Eds. Colvin & Newman 1981, 135
- 81 Waldstein f.159 Ed. Groos 1981, 113
- 82 The coherence of their ordered and symmetrical disposition has however been disturbed by the addition of later groups that are not so arranged on the north roof (marked X & Y on Plan F6)
- 83 Cecil Certain Precepts ... Ed. L. Wright 1962, 11
- 84 Read 1955, 115-116
- 85 HMC Salisbury series 9 Vol 1, 543
- 86 Heal 1990, 54
- 87 Heal 1990, 54
- 88 Heal 1990, 59
- 89 Thurley 1993, 68 & 70
- 90 Thurley 1993, 68 & Heal 1990, 59
- 91 A frieze still survives on the first floor of the east range and is of remarkably high quality in style and execution. The King visited with Ann Bolyn in 1535 (Bell, R. & K. Rodwell 'Acton Court, Avon: An Early Tudor Courtier House' in *Airs* (Ed.) 1994, 55
- 92 Heal 1990,56
- 93 Harrison Ed. Edelen 1968, 201-202; Camden Ed. 1675, 206
- 94 Heal 1984, 68
- 95 See McClung 1977, 18-45
- 96 William Langland(?) The Vision of William Concerning Piers the Plowman Ed. W. Skeat (Oxford, 1886) I, 292; quoted for example in McClung 1977, 29, lamenting the new habit of the lord who, with his lady, "Now hath uche riche a reule to eten

- by hym-selve/In a pryve parloure...Or in a chambre with a chymneye and leve the chief halle/That was made for meles men to eten inne"
- 97 Arber Ed. 1895, 53
- 98 Nichols 1828 Vol 1, 103
- 99 See Gombrich's analysis of "The Economy of Vision" (Gombrich 1984, 95-116)
- 100 Cecil 1585, Sp 12/181/32, printed in Gent. Mag Vol cvi pt 1,149
- 101 Cicero Ed. & Trans. Griffin & Atkins 1991, 55
- 102 Thomas and Dorothy were to have seven daughters and five sons
- 103 See for example, Leicester's letter to Cecil SP Dom 12/172/37, and Peck (1732-35) Lib III, 31
- 104 HMC Salisbury Vol 2 no 603, 25 September 1578
- 105 Cicero Ed. & Trans. Griffin & Atkins 1991, 54. Cecil's father, as mentioned in chapter 3, had a great reputation for hospitality or "port", the word which means both hospitality or style of living and "the manner in which one bears oneself"(1568) (OED)
- 106 North, for example, describes the earlier custom of having a "lanthorne, to lett out the smoak and stench" over a great hall as "comon eating room" which was "consequently an indication of great dignity and plenty." (North Eds Colvin & Newman 1981, 125.) In the treatises of De l'Orme and du Cerceau working chimneys are noticeably the only animate feature in the illustrations of domestic buildings
- 107 Jonson To Penshurst (by 1612) in Ed. Woudhuysen 1992, 422 & 420
- 108 Jonson To Penshurst Ed. Woudhuysen 1992, 422. He conveniently omits and reference to the classical loggia at Penshurst
- 109 Hall Virgidemiarum Book 5 Ed. Woudhuysen 1992,406-408 "Iberian pride" is a reference to the Escorial
- 110 Hall Virgidemiarum Book 5 Ed. Woudhuysen 1992, 406-408
- 111 Hall Virgidemiarum Book 5 Ed. Woudhuysen 1992, 406-408
- 112 Hamlet Act 2, scene II
- 113 Cecil (c.1586) printed in Ed. L. B. Wright 1961, 10
- 114 Cicero Ed. & Trans. Griffin & Atkins 1991, 88
- 115 Quoted in Yates 1985, 62
- 116 As that at Burghley was reported to have been during King James' visit in 1603 (Nichols 1828 Vol I, 96)
- 117 Ashmole 1672, 189
- 118 Cecil to Marquis of Winchester July 1566 BL Cotton MSS, Titus B xiii f. 173; quoted in Read 1955, 352
- 119 SP Dom 12/201/40, Cecil to Walsingham May 22 1587
- 120 SP Dom 12/193/28 Cecil to Walsingham 10 September 1586
- 121 BL Harleian MSS 6994, f.68 Walsingham to Cecil May 23 1586; quoted in Read 1960, 413 (Burghley House was not in fact in Lincolnshire, nor had Cecil claimed to Walsingham that this was so. But the oversight on Walsingham's part does not alter the significance of the house in this context, if anything it emphasises the value attached to it in political terms. As expressed in the Cyville and Uncyville Life published in 1579, "...the more resort he has the more is the Maister of the house honoured, and the more authority a Gentleman hath in the shier, the more is the resort unto him" (quoted in Heal 1984, 74)
- 122 Alberti Book IX Ch i, Ed. Leoni 1755, 187
- 123 Peck 1732-5, Lib III, 34
- 124 Sidney The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia Bk 1, Ch 2 Ed. Evans 1977, 71

-
- 125 Walpole's description of Longleat. (Walpole in Ed. 1927-28, 45); and see Girouard's description of the serious discrepancies between the relationships of interior and exterior at Longleat (Girouard 1983 ,54)
- 126 Walpole in Ed. 1927-28, 58 (referring to Burghley)
- 127 Jonson To Penshurst Ed. Woudhuysen 1992, 423
- 128 Sidney The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia Bk 1, Ch 2 Ed. Evans 1977, 71
- 129 Pevsner 1985, 306
- 130 Pevsner 1985, 306
- 131 Vitruvius Bk I Ch ii, Trans. Warren 1960, 14
- 132 Nichols 1828 Vol I, 135-139
- 133 Nichols 1828 Vol I, 121
- 134 Nichols 1828 Vol I, 95-96 (from Samuel Daniel's account of the visit)
- 135 Leatham 199, 177 & 180-181
- 136 Gill 1972, 31
- 137 Penner, 1991 Imposing surroundings, sporting activities and "recreational outlets" are essential, "the design challenge begins with the approach to the building". "the larger rooms used for meetings may also serve to provide private dining facilities for delegates" "the reception space" should be "of ample space and character appropriate to its function of welcoming guests and serving as a popular meeting place" "the route to the conference and meeting spaces must be obvious" "a banqueting hall should create a sense of occasion and excitement. A tall ceiling is required" "cool nights make a guestroom fireplace a welcome amenity" Lodging suites, including "closet space" are grouped together, often round a s courtyard. "dining and lounge operations are often orientate towards a view...landscaped grounds, recreational feature or more distant vista" Seating should be provided in semi-private alcoves to eliminate the sense of the large or institutional" "the architect and designer should consider the possibilities for creating small distinct areas, such as raised platforms, sunken seating wells..." etc. etc.
- 138 See Chapter 1 fn.192
- 139 A "Castel with fallyng sydes" was actually constructed for the entertainment of the Duke of Anjou in the autumn of 1581. (Chambers Vol 1, 167)
- 140 Information supplied by Imagination the company who arranged the whole launch for Ford. Quotation taken from a review of 'Imagination' in 1986: in 'Direction' (Supplement to Campaign) 21 March 1986, 34. The spectacular nature of the launch is by no means an isolated example. Microsoft for instance make extensive use of their whole headquarters complex in America to host 'virtual reality' events.
- 141 L. P. Hartley opening lines of The Go Between

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The bibliography is arranged as follows:

1. Primary Sources I; Manuscripts and Calendars
2. Primary Sources II; Printed Works to 1700, in Original or Later Editions
3. Secondary Sources; Post 1700
4. Unpublished Theses and Dissertations
5. Other Unpublished works

1. PRIMARY SOURCES I; MANUSCRIPTS AND CALENDARS

Burghley

Exeter MSS, Burghley House Archives (Reference numbers given from HMC Commission National Register of Archives from originals prepared by the Northants Record Office, 1958)

Hatfield

Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquess of Salisbury etc. (Comprising State correspondence during the administration of Sir William Cecil, afterwards Lord Burghley

Longleat

Records of the Building of Longleat 3 Vols (original bills, letters etc. and transcripts of original documents collected by Canon Jackson in the nineteenth century)

London, British Library

BL Cotton MSS

BL Harleian MSS

BL Lansdowne MSS

London, Public Records Office

Baschet Transcripts XC6488 PRO 31/3/26

Exchequer, Treasury of the Receipts, Miscellaneous Books
E/39

MPC, MR etc. Maps and Plans

Parliamentary Survey of Theobalds House, Hartford (May
1650) E317/Herts/26

State Papers Domestic Edward VI SP Dom 10

State Papers Domestic Mary SP Dom 11

State Papers Domestic Elizabeth SP Dom 12

State Papers Elizabeth, Addenda SP15

State Papers Elizabeth, Ireland SP 63

State Papers Elizabeth Foreign SP 70

Catalogue of the Lansdowne MSS Eds H.H. Barber & H. Ellis 2 Vols
(London, 1812-19)

Calendar of the Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Rutland
preservEd at Belvoir Castle HMC 3 Vols. 12th Report Appendices
Pt IV & Pt V, 14th Report Appendix Pt 1, with intros. by H.
Maxwell Lyte (London 1888-9 & 1894)

Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Most Hon. the Marquess of
Salisbury etc. (Comprising State correspondence during the
administration of Sir William Cecil, afterwards Lord Burghley
HMC No. 9, (1883)

Calendar of State Papers relating to Border Affairs Ed.. J. Bain
(Edinburgh, 1894-96)

Calendar of State Papers, Domestic Series Eds R. Lemon & M.A.
Green (London, 1856-72)

Calendar of State Papers Foreign Series Eds J. Stevens et al.
(London, 1863-1960)

Calendar of State Papers Relating to Scotland and Mary Queen of Scots Eds J. Bain et al. (Edinburgh, 1898-1952)

Calendar of State Papers of Ireland of the reigns of Henry VIII Edward VI Mary and Elizabeth Ed. H.C. Hamilton (reprint Wiesbaden, 1974)

Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-1547 21 vols. & Addenda,
Eds J. Brewer, J. Gairdner & R. Brodie
(London, 1862-1932)

2. PRIMARY SOURCES II: PRINTED WORKS TO 1700 IN ORIGINAL OR LATER EDITIONS

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| Alberti, L. B. | <u>The Ten Books of Architecture</u> Ed
Leoni (London,1755) Facsimile
Edition New York, 1986; 1st Pub.
1485 |
| Arber, E. | <u>Table Talk</u> English Reprints No 6
(London, 1895) |
| Ascham, R. | <u>The Scholemaster</u> , English Reprints,
Ed. E. Arber (London, 1923; 1st Pub.
London,1570) |
| Ascham, Roger | <u>Rogeri Aschami Epistolorum Libri
Quattuor</u> (Oxford,1703) Ed. W. Elstob. |
| Ascham, Roger | <u>The English Works of Roger
Ascham.....</u> Ed. W.A. Wright
(Cambridge 1904; 1st Pub. London
1761) |
| Ashmole, E. | <u>The Institution Laws and Ceremonies
of the Most Noble Order of the Garter</u>
(London, 1672) |

- Aubrey, John Brief Lives Ed. R. Barber (London, 1982; 1st Pub. 1813; written 1669-96)
- Bacon, F. The Advancement of Learning and New Atlantis, Ed. A. Johnson (Oxford, 1974; 1st Pub. 1627)
- Bacon, F. Essays, Ed. with an introduction by M.J. Hawkins (London, 1972; 1st Pub. 1597)
- Bibliotheca Illustrissima (London 1687) 'Catalogus Variorum Librorum'
- Boorde, Andrew A Compendyous Regyment or a Dyetary of Helth, a Facsimile reprint of the 4th Edition, with notes of differences from 1st, 2nd and 3rd Editions, Ed. F. Furnivall (London 1870; 1st Pub. 1542)
- Cabala Sive Scrivina Sacra: Mysteries of State Government in letters of Illustrious persons in the reign of Henry VIII, Queen Elizabeth I, James I (London, 1654-1691; 1691 Edition)
- Camden, William Annales of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth Trans. and Ed. T.Hearne 3 Vols (London, 1717)
- Camden, William The Life of that Great Statesman Lord Burghley publishEd from the original Manuscript 'wrote soon after his Lordship's death', with notes by Arthur Collins (London, 1732)

- Camden, William Britannia Ed. E. Gibson facsimile of the 1695 Edition (Newton Abbot, 1971)
- Camden, William Britannia Trans and Ed. R. Gough from the 1607 Edition "enlargEd by the latest discoveries" 3 Vols (London 1780)
- Castiglione, Baldesar The Book of the Courtier Trans. and Ed. G. Bull (Harmondsworth, 1976; 1st Pub. Venice 1528)
- Cavendish, George 'The Life and Death of Cardinal Wolsey by George Cavendish' Ed.. R. Sylvester Early English Text Society CCXLIII (1959)
- Cecil, R./James VI 'Correspondence of King James VI of Scotland with Sir Robert Cecil and others during the reign of Queen Elizabeth' Ed. J. Bruce Camden Society LXXVIII, 1861
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius Those fyve Question, which Marke Tullye Cicero, disputEd in his Manor of Tusculanum Trans. John Dolman (London 1961)
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius De Senectute in Cicero trans. W. Falconer 28 Vols, Vol 20 (London, 1971)
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius On Duties, Eds M.T. Griffin & E. M. Aitkins (Cambridge, 1991)
- Clapham, J. Elizabeth of England: Certain Observations Concerning the Life and Reign of Queen Elizabeth by John Clapham, Eds C. Read & E. Read (Philadelphia, 1951; Unpublished MSS written early seventeenth century)

- Collona, Francesco Hypnerotomachia Poliphili facsimile reprint Hypnerotomachia: the Strife of Love in a Dreame (1592) by Francesco Collona Trans. by R.D. Ed. and Introduction L. Gent (Delmar NY, 1973)
- Cousin, J. De Perspective (Paris, 1560)
- Daniel, Samuel Poems and a Defense of Ryme Ed. A. Colby Sprague (Cambridge Mass., 1930)
- De l'Orme, P. Le Premier tome de l'architecture (Paris 1567)
- De l'Orme, P. Nouvelles inventions pour bien bastir aux petits frais (Paris, 1576)
- De Maisse, André A Journal of all that was AccomplishEd by Monsier de Maisse, ambassador in England from King Henri IV to Queen Elizabeth, 1597 Trans. & Eds G. Harrison & R. Jones (London 1931)
- A Discourse of the Common Weal of this realm of England Ed. E. Lamond (Cambridge 1954; 1st Pub. 1581)
- Du Cerceau, J.A. Les Plus excellents bastiments de France (Paris 1576/9)
- Ellis, H., Ed. 'Original Letters of Eminent Literary Men of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries' 2 vols Camden Society 1st Series Vol 23 No 265 (1843)
- Erasmus, Desiderius In Praise of Folly Trans. B. Radice (Harmondsworth, 1993; 1st Pub. 1515)

- Evelyn, J. Diary, Ed. E.S. de Beer (new Edition Oxford, 1959; 1st Pub. 1818-1819)
- Fiennes, Celia The Journeys of Celia Fiennes Ed.. C. Morris (London, 1949; written c.1685-1703)
- Fuller, T. The Worthies of England, Ed. J. Freeman (London, 1952; 1st Pub. 1662)
- Gerard, John Catalogus Arborum, Fruticum, ac Plantarum indigenarum, quam exoticarum, in horto Johannis Gerardi (London, 1596)
- Gerard, John The herball or generall historie of plantes (London, 1597)
- Gershow, F. 'Diary of the Journey of Philip Julius, Duke of Stettin-Pomerania, Through England in the Year 1602' (written by his secretary, Gershow Trans. RHS NS Vol. VI, Ed. G. von Bülow (1892) 1-68
- Harleian Miscellany 'A collection of scarce, curious and entertaining pamphlets and tracts....found in the late Earl of Oxford's library. Interspersed with curious political and critical notes etc.' Into. S. Juenson, 7 Vols (London, 1744-46)
- Harrison, William The Description of England, Ed. G. Edelen (New York, 1968, text from the 1587 Edition; 1st Pub. London, 1577)
- Hayes, S. & Murdin, W. Eds A Collection of State Papers... Transcribed from original letters and other authentick memorials...left by William Cecil Lord Burghley etc 2 Vols (London, 1740-1759)

- Hentzner, P. Translation of Paul Hentzner's Journey made in 1592 Ed. & Trans. H. Walpole (Strawberry Hill, 1758)
- Hill, Thomas The Gardener's Labyrinth, publishEd posthumously under the pseudonym Dydimous Mountain (London 1587; 1st Pub. 1577)
- Hill, Thomas The Gardener's Labyrinth Ed. R. Mabey basEd on the 1652 Edition (Oxford 1988)
- Hilliard, N. A Treatise Concerning the Arte of Limning, Eds R. Thornton & T. Cain (Ashington, 1992; written c. 1598-1603)
- Hoby, Thomas 'A Booke of the Travaile and Lief of Me, Thomas Hoby, Wt Diverse Things Woorth the Notinge', The Camden Miscellany Vol. 10, Ed. E. Powell (London, 1902; Written, 1547-1564)
- Homer The Iliad, trans. M. Hammond (London 1987)
- Laneham, R. [?] Robert Laneham's Letter, Ed. F. Furnivall (New York and London, 1907; 1st printed, 1575)
- Machiavelli, Niccolò The Prince Trans. G. Bull (Harmondsworth, 1981)
- More, Sir Thomas Utopia Ed. E. Surtz & J. Hexter (New Haven & London, 1965; 1st Pub. Louvain, 1516)
- North, Roger Of Buildings: Roger North's Writings on Architecture Eds Colvin, H. & J. Newman, (Oxford, 1981) written before 1691, but not publishEd

- Ovid Metamorphoses, trans. Mary M. Innes (London, 1955)
- Palladio, Andrea The Four Books of Architecture (Isaac Ware, London 1738 Facsimile reprint of the 1738 Edition) (1st Pub. Venice, 1570)
- Peacham, Henry The Compleat Gentleman The truth of our Times and the Art of Living in London (London 1634, Ed. G.S. Gordon, Oxford 1906; 1st Pub. 1622)
- Plat, Sir Hugh Floraes Paradise (London, 1608)
- Platter, T. Thomas Platter's Travels 1599, Ed. C. Williams (London, 1937)
- Pliny the Elder Natural History. A Selection trans. and intro. by J.F. Healy (London, 1991)
- Pliny the Younger The Letters of the Younger Pliny, Ed. & Trans. B. Radice (London, 1969)
- Puttenham, G. The Art of English Poesie Ed. G. Wilcock & A. Walker (Cambridge 1936; 1st Pub. in 1589 and dedicated to Cecil by the publisher)
- Rye, W. England as Seen by Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James the First (London, 1865)
- Serlio, Sebastiano Extraordinario libro di architettura di Sebastiano Serlio Bolognese (Venice, 1558)
- Serlio, Sebastiano Libro primo [to quinto] di architettura di Sebastiano Serlio Bolognese (Venice 1559-62)

- Serlio, Sebastiano Tutte l'opera d'architettura di Sebastiano Serlio Bolognese (Venice, 1584)
- Serlio, Sebastiano The Five Books of Architecture An Unabridged Reprint of the English Edition of 1611 (New York, 1982)
- Shute, John The First and Chief Grounds of Architecture usEd in all the Ancient and Famous Monuments, Facsimile of the 1st Edition of 1563, Intro. L Weaver (London, 1912)
- Sidney, Philip The Old Arcadia Ed. K. Duncan-Jones (Oxford, 1990; written c.1580-)
- Sidney, Philip The Countess of Pembroke's Arcadia Ed.. and intro. Maurice Evans (Harmondsworth 1977; 1st Pub.1590)
- Sidney, Philip An Apologie for Poetrie Ed.. M. Shepherd (London, 1965; 1st Pub. 1595)
- Spenser, E. Spenser: Poetical Works, Eds J. Smith & E. de Selincourt (Oxford, 1991)
- Stow, John A Survey of London by John Stow Ed.. C. Kingsford (Oxford 1908; reprinted from the text of 1603; 1st Pub. 1595)
- Strype, J. Annals of the Reformation and Establishment of Religion....during Queen Elizabeth's Reign 4 Vols (Oxford,1824; 1st Pub. 1709)
- Thomas, William The Pilgrim Ed. J. Froude (London1861; 1st Pub.1542)

- Thorpe, John The Book of Architecture of John Thorpe held at Sir John Soane's Museum (Compiled in the seventeenth century)
- Tytler, P.F., Ed. England Under the Reigns of Edward VI and Mary, Original letters 2 Vols (London, 1839)
- Vasari, G. Lives of the Artists, trans. G. Bull (Harmondsworth, 1965; 1st Pub. Florence, 1550)
- Vergil, Polydore 'Historiae Anglicae libri viginti septen', Ed. and trans. D. Hay, Camden Society 3rd Series (London, 1950; 1st Pub.1534)
- Virgil The Eclogues. The Georgics, trans. C. Day Lewis (Oxford, 1983)
- Virgil The Aeneid, trans. W. Jackson Knight (Harmondsworth, 1974)
- Vitruvius, Marcus Pollio Vitruvius: the Ten books on Architecture, trans. M. Hickey Morgan (New York, 1960)
- Von Wedel, L. 'Journey through England and Scotland made by Leopold Von WEDEL in the year 1594 and 1595' Trans.RHS Vol ix, 223-270 , 1895.
- Waldstein The Diary of Baron Waldstein, trans. and Ed. G.W. Groos (London, 1981)
- Whetstone, George A Heptameron of Civil Discourse (London, 1582)

- Whitney, Geoffrey A Choice of Emblemes 1st
Pub.Leyden 1586; facsimile of
original Edition with introduction by
J. Manning, (Aldershot, 1989)
- Wotton, Sir Henry The Elements of Architecture
(London, 1624)
- Woudhuysen, H.R., Ed. The Penguin Book of Renaissance
Verse 1509 - 1659, Intro. D. Norbook
(Harmondsworth, 1992)
- Wright, L.B., Ed. Advice to a Son; Precepts of Lord
Burghley, Sir Walter Raleigh, and
Francis Osborn (Cornell, 1962)
- Wright, T. Queen Elizabeth and Her Times 2
vols., Original documents (London,
1838)

3. SECONDARY SOURCES; POST 1700

- Ackerman, J.S. The Cortile de Belvedere (Vatican
City 1954)
- Ackerman, J.S. Palladio (Harmondsworth, 1983)
- Ackerman, J.S. 'The Geopolitics of Venetian
Architecture in the Time of Titian' in
Titian: his World and his Legacy D.
Rosand (New York, 1982) 41-71
- Ackerman, J.S. The Villa, Form & Ideology of
Country Houses (Princeton, 1990)
- Airs, M. The Making of the English Country House
(London, 1975)
- Airs, M. 'The designing of five East Anglican
country houses, 1505-1637', AH vol.
21 (1978), 58-67

- Airs, M. 'The English country house in the Sixteenth Century', Oxford Art Journal no. 2 (1979), 15-18
- Airs, M. The Buildings of Britain. Tudor and Jacobean. A Guide and Gazetteer (London, etc., 1982)
- Airs, M. Ed. The Tudor and Jacobean Great House (Oxford 1994)
- Andrews, J. Ireland in Maps (Dublin, 1961)
- Andrews, M. 'Theobalds Palace: The Gardens and Park' Garden History (17 Dec., 1993), 129-149
- Anglo, S. Spectacle, Pageantry and Early Tudor Policy (Oxford, 1969)
- Anglo, S. Images of Tudor Kingship (London, 1992)
- Ashley, L. George Peele (New York, 1970)
- Ashmole, F. The History of the Institutions of the Order of the Garter etc. (London 1672)
- Aston, M. 'English Ruins and English History: The Dissolution of the Monasteries and the Sense of the Past' WCJ 36 (1973) 231-255
- Auerbach, E. Tudor Artists (London, 1954)
- Aumuller, E. Les Petits Maîtres Allemands (Munich, 1893)
- Axton, M. The Queen's Two Bodies: Drama and the Elizabethan Succession (London, 1977)
- Baillie, H.M. 'Etiquette and the Planning in State

- Apartment in Baroque Palaces',
Arch 101 (1967), 169-99
- Baker, G. The History and Antiquities of Northamptonshire 2 Vols (London, 1822-1830)
- Barnard, F.P., Ed. William Cecil, Lord Burghley Historic Monograph series Vol I (no others published) A. Jessop, A. Gotch et al (London, 1904)
- Barnett, R. Place, Profit and Power; A Study of the Servants of William Cecil (N. Carolina, 1969)
- Batey, M. 'Horace Walpole as a Modern Garden Historian' Garden History Vol 19 No 1 (1991), 1-11
- Bath, M. Speaking Pictures, English Emblem Books and Renaissance Culture (London, 1994)
- Bayley, P., Ed. Spenser: The Faerie Queene A Selection of Critical Essays (London, 1990)
- Beard, G. Decorative Plasterwork in Great Britain (London, 1975)
- Beard, G. Stucco & Decorative Plasterwork (London, 1983)
- Beckingsale, B. W. Burghley Tudor Statesman 1520-1598 (London & New York, 1967)
- Bek, L. 'The Staircase and the Code of Conduct', in L'escalier dans l'architecture de la Renaissance Eds Guillaume & Chastel, 1985, 117-122
- Bergeron, D.M. English Civic Pageantry 1558-1642 (London, 1971)

- Biddle, M. 'Nonsuch Palace 1956-60: Interim Report', Surrey Archaeological Collections lviii (1961), 1-20
- Biddle, M. 'Nonsuch Palace' Jnl. of the London Society 363 (1963), 14-30
- Biddle, M. 'Nicholas Bellin da Modena: an Italian Artificer at the Courts of Francis I and Henry VIII', BAAJ 3rd series xxix (1966), 106-21
- Biddle, M. 'A Fontainebleau Chimneypiece at Broughton Castle, Oxfordshire', The Country Seat. Studies in the History of the British Country House presentEd to Sir John Summerson, Eds H. Colvin & J. Harris (London, 1970), 9-12
- Biddle, M. 'Early Renaissance at Winchester' in Winchester CathEdral, Nine HundrEd Years Ed. J. Crook (Chichester, 1993) 257-304
- Bindoff, S., Ed., et al. Elizabethan Government and Society (London 1961)
- Binney, M. 'Loseley Park, Surrey', CL CXLVI (2 & 9 Oct. 1969), 802-5 & 894-7
- Binney M. 'Penshurst Place, Kent' Pt III CL CLI (27 April 1972), 994-998
- Binney, M. 'The Rescue of Dingley Hall' CL CLXVII, (27 Nov. 1980) 1990-1993
- Blomfield, Sir R. History of French Architecture, 1494-1661, 2 Vols (London, 1911)
- Blunt, A. Philibert de l'Orme (London, 1958)

- Blunt, A. 'L'influence Française sur l'Architecture et la Sculpture Decorative en Angleterre Pendant la Première Moitié du Seizième Siècle', Revue de l'Art iv (1969), 17-29
- Blunt, A. Art and Architecture in France 1500-1700 (London, 1982)
- Borsook, E. The Companion Guide to Florence (London, 1985)
- Boucher, B. Andrea Palladio: The Architect in His Time (London, 1994)
- Boucher, B. 'Decorative Balancing Act', CL CLXXXVII (29 Sept 1994), 80-83
- Boynton, L. The Hardwick Hall Inventories of 1601 (London, 1971)
- Braunmuller, A. & Hattaway, M. Eds The Cambridge Companion to English Renaissance Drama (Cambridge, 1990)
- Bridges, J. History and Antiquities of Northamptonshire Ed. P. Whalley (Oxford, 1791)
- Brown, J. The Art and Architecture of English Gardens (London, 1989)
- Bullen, A. The Works of George Peele (London, 1888)
- Burgon, J. The Life and Times of Sir Thomas Gresham, 2 vols, Facsimile reprint, Ed. B. Franklin (New York; 1st Pub. London, 1839)
- Burnett, D. Longleat. The Story of an English Country House (Stanbridge, 1988; 1st Pub. 1978)

- Burnett-Brown, J. Lacock Abbey (London, 1986)
- Castell, R. The Villas of the Ancients IllustratEd (London, 1728), Facsimile Edition, Ed. J. Dixon Hunt, titled The English Landscape Garden (London, 1982)
- Chambers, E.K. The Elizabethan Stage 4 Vols (London, 1961; first publishEd 1923)
- Chaney, E. & P. Mack England and the continental Renaissance : Essays in honour of J.B. Trapp (Woodbridge, 1990)
- Charlton, K. Education in Renaissance England (London, 1965)
- Clancy, T. Papist Pamphleteers (Chicago, 1964)
- Clapham, A. & W. Godfrey Some Famous Buildings and Their Story (London, 1914)
- Clark-Maxwell, W.G. 'Sir William Sharington's Work at Lacock, Sudeley and Dudley', AJ LXX (1913), 176-182
- Clifford, D. A History of Garden Design (London, 1962)
- Clifton-Taylor, A. English Stone Building (London, 1983)
- Clifton-Taylor, A. The Pattern of English Building 4th Edition, Ed. J. Simmons (London, 1987)
- Cokayne, G. E. The Complete Peerage of England, Scotland, Ireland, Great Britain and the UnitEd Kingdom, new Edition by Hon Vicary Gibbs et al 13 Vols (London, 1910-1940)

- Colvin, H. & J. Harris, Eds The Country Seat. Studies in the History of the British Country House (London, 1970)
- Colvin, H. et al The History of the King's Works, vol. III: 1485-1660 (part I) (London, 1975), vol. IV: 1485-1660 (part II) (London, 1982)
- Comito, T. The Idea of the Garden in the Renaissance (Hassocks, 1979)
- Coope, R. 'The Gallery in England, Names and Meanings', AH 27 (1984), 446-55
- Coope, R. 'The "Long Gallery": Its Origins, Development, Use and Decoration', AH 29 (1986), 43-71
- Cooper, J.P. Land, Men and Beliefs. Studies in Early Modern History (London, 1983)
- Cooper, R. 'Collectors of Coins and Numismatic Scholarship in Early Renaissance France' Warburg Institute Surveys & Texts Vol XXI (1990) 3-23
- Cornforth, J. 'In search of a Pedigree', CL CLXXXV(10 Oct.1991), 82-85
- Croft-Murray, E. Decorative Painting in England 1537-1837, Early Tudor to Sir James Thornhill Vol. 1 (London, 1962)
- Cust, L. 'Notes on Pictures in the Royal Collections: xxxix, on the Portraits of King Henry VIII' Burl. Mag XXXI (1917), 217-24
- Cust, L. 'The Lumley Inventories', Walpole Society VI(1917-18), 15-35
- Davey, N. A History of Building Materials (London, 1961)

- de Biève, E. 'Public Order in the Low Countries' in L'emploi des ordres dans l'architecture de la Renaissance Ed.s Guillaume & Chastel (Paris,1992)
- Dewar, M. Sir Thomas Smith (London, 1964)
- Dictionary of National Biography Compact Edition complete text reproduced micrographically, 2 Vols (Oxford, 1975)
- Dix., B. 'Towards the Restoration of a Period Garden', Garden Archaeology, Ed. A. Brown (CBA Research Report 78, 1991) 1-12
- Dovey, Z. An Elizabethan Progress: The Queen's Journey into East Anglia, 1578 (Stroud, 1996)
- Drakard, J. (Publisher) The Guide to Burghley House: Paintings & Antiquities etc. (Stamford, 1815)
- Drury, P. 'No other palace in the Kingdom will compare with it: The Evolution of Audley End, 1605-1745', AH 23 (1980), 1-39
- Drury, P. 'The Tomb of the First Lord Mordaunt' BAAJ CXXXIX (1982) 24-25
- Drury, P. 'A Fayre House, Buylt by Sir Thomas Smith: The Development of Hill Hall, Essex, 1557-81', BAAJ CXXXVI (1983), 98-123
- Duncan-Jones, K. Sir Philip Sidney; Courtier Poet (London, 1991)
- Dunlop, I. Palaces and Progresses of Elizabeth I (London 1962)

- Durant, D. Bess of Hardwick: Portrait of an Elizabethan Dynast (London 1977)
- Durant, D. The building of Hardwick Hall, Part 1 The Old Hall 1587-1591 (London, 1980); Part 2 The New Hall (London, 1984)
- Edwards, J. 'Theobalds Manor Palace and Park' Herts. Past and Present Vol 7 (1967), 27
- Emmison, F.G. Tudor Secretary. Sir William Petre at Court and Home (London, 1961)
- Evetts, D. Literature and the Visual Arts in Tudor England (London, 1990)
- Fairclough, G. 'Meaningful constructions - spatial and functional analysis of medieval buildings' Antiquity Vol 66 (1992) 348-366
- Fermor, S. Piero di Cosimo: Fiction, Invention and Fantasia (London, 1993)
- Finch, M.E. 'The Wealth of Five Northamptonshire Families 1540-1660', Northants. Record Soc. vol. XIX (1956)
- Fitch Lyle, G. & S. Orgel, Eds Patronage in the Renaissance (Princeton, NJ, 1981)
- Flower, R. 'Lawrence Nowell and the Discovery of England in Tudor Times', Proc. British Academy Vol XXI (1935), 47-73
- Foister, S. 'Paintings and Other Works of Art in Sixteenth-century English Inventories', Burl. Mag. cxxiii (1981), 273-82

- Ford, B. Ed. The New Pelican Guide to English Literature, Vol. 2: The Age of Shakespeare (London, 1982: 1st Pub., 1955)
- French, P. John Dee: The World of an Elizabethan Magus (London, 1972)
- Friedman, A. House and Household in Elizabethan England. Wollaton Hall and the Willoughby Family (Chicago, 1989)
- Froude, J. A history of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the defeat of the Spanish Armada 5 Vols (London, 1912)
- Furnivall, F.J.&
L. Withington, Eds Elizabethan England, Intro. F.J. Furnivall (London & Newcastle-on-Tyne, 1876)
- Garner, T. &
A. Stratton The Domestic Architecture of England during the Tudor Period 2 vols. (2nd rev. Ed. London, 1929)
- Gent, L. Picture and Poetry, 1560-1620: Visual Arts in Renaissance England (Leamington Spa, 1981)
- Gent, L. Ed. Albion's Classicism: The Visual Arts in Britain, 1550-1660 (New Haven & London, 1995)
- Gill, R. Happy Rural Seat: The English Country House in the Literary Imagination (London 1972)
- Girouard, M. 'New Light on Longleat', CL CXX (1956), 594-97
- Girouard, M. 'The Development of Longleat House 1546-72', AJ Vol. CXVI (1959), 200-221

- Girouard, M. 'Elizabethan Architecture and the Gothic Tradition', AH 6 (1963), 23-29
- Girouard, M. 'Renaissance Splendour in Decay' CL CXXXV (9 Jan 1964), 70-73
- Girouard, M. 'Elizabethan Chatsworth', CL CLIV (1973), 1668-72
- Girouard, M. Hardwick Hall (London, 1976)
- Girouard, M. 'Elizabethan Holdenby', CL CLXVI (18 and 25 Oct 1979), 1286-1289 & 1398-1401
- Girouard, M. Life in the English Country House (Harmondsworth, 1980)
- Girouard, M. Robert Smythson and the Elizabethan Country House (New Haven & London, 1983)
- Girouard, M. 'Burghley House, Lincolnshire', CL CLXXXVI (pt I, 23 April; pt II, 30 April, 1992), 56-59 & 58-61
- Girouard, M. 'Still Waters, Still Deep' CL CLXXXVII (11 Feb 1993), 46-49
- Goldthwaite, R. The Building of Renaissance Florence, An Economic & Social History (Baltimore, 1980)
- Gombrich, E.H. The Sense of Order (Oxford, 1984)
- Gordon, D. 'Poet and Architect: The Intellectual Setting of the Quarrel between Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones' WCJ xii (1949) 152-178
- Gordon Smith, A. William Cecil (New York, 1971; 1st Pub. 1934)

- Gotch, A.J. Architecture of the Renaissance in England (London, 1894)
- Gotch, A.J. 'The Renaissance in Northamptonshire' RIBA Transactions Vol VI New Series (1890) LXVII, 87-114
- Gotch A.J. 'Heraldry of the Renaissance in England' Journal RIBA IV 3rd Series (1897) 265-77
- Gotch, A.J. Early Renaissance Architecture in England (2nd Ed. London, 1914; 1st Pub. London, 1901)
- Gotch, A.J. 'The Homes of the Cecils' Pt II in William Cecil, Lord Burghley Ed F.P. Barnard Historic Monograph series Vol I (no others published) A. Jessop, A. Gotch et al (London, 1904)
- Gotch, A.J. The Growth of the English House (London, 1909)
- Gotch A.J. The Old Halls and Manor-Houses of Northamptonshire (London, 1936)
- Graves, M. Elizabethan Parliaments 1559-1601 (London & New York, 1991)
- Greenblatt, S. Renaissance Self-Fashioning from More to Shakespeare (Chicago, 1984)
- Greenblatt, S., Ed. Representing the Renaissance (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1988)
- Greg, W. 'Books and Bookmen in the Correspondence of Archbishop Parker', The Library Fourth Series Vol XVI no. 3 (1935), 243-277

- Guiffrey, J. Les Dessins de l'Histoire des Rois de France par Nicholas Houel (Paris, 1920)
- Guillaume, J. & A. Chastel, Eds L'Escalier dans L'Architecture de la Renaissance, Series: 'De Architectura' (Paris, 1985)
- Guillaume, J. 'L'Escalier dans l'Architecture Française: la Première Moitié du XVI Siècle', in Guillaume & Chastel (Paris, 1985), 27-47
- Guillaume, J. & A. Chastel, Eds Les Traités d'Architecture Series: 'De Architectura' (Paris, 1988)
- Guillaume, J. Ed. Architecture et Vie Sociale, Series: 'De Architectura' (Paris, 1994)
- Gundersheimer, W. 'Patronage in the Renaissance: An Exploratory Approach', Patronage in the Renaissance, Eds G. Fitch Lyle & S. Orgel (Princeton, NJ, 1981)
- Guy, J. Tudor England (Oxford, 1991)
- Hadfield, M. A History of British Gardening (Harmondsworth, 1985)
- Haigh, C., Ed. The Reign of Elizabeth I (London, 1991)
- Hake, H. 'The English Historic Portrait: Document and Myth', Proceedings of the British Academy xxix (1943), 138-140
- Hale, J. The Civilization of Europe in the Renaissance (London, 1993)

- Harris, J. A Country House Index: An Index to Illustrations PublishEd 1715-1782, and a List of Country House Guides and Country House Art Collection Catalogues for the Period 1726-1870 (London, 1971)
- Harris, J. The Artist and the Country House from the Fifteenth Century to the Present Day Exhibition Catalogue (London, 1995)
- Harvey, J. 'The Building Works and Architects of Cardinal Wolsey. An essay, basEd largely upon the original documents, on the Gothic design of the early Sixteenth Century', BAAJ 3rd ser. VIII (1943), 50-59
- Harvey, J. English Medieval Architects: a Biographical Dictionary down to 1550 (rev. Ed. Gloucester, 1984)
- Harvey, P. Maps in Tudor England (London, 1993)
- Hautecoeur, L. Histoire de l'Architecture Classique en France (Paris, 1963), tome 1: La Formation de l'Idéal Classique 1: La Première Renaissance (1495 à 1535-40)
- Haynes, A. Robert Cecil, 1st Earl of Salisbury 1563-1612 (London, 1989)
- Hearn, K. Dynasties: Painting in Tudor and Jacobean England 1530-1630 (London 1995)
- Heal, F. 'The Idea of Hospitality in Early Modern England' Past & Present 102 (1984)

- Heal, F. Hospitality in Early Modern England (Oxford 1990)
- Heckscher, W. 'Bernini's Elephant and Obelisk', Art Bulletin 29 (1947), 155-182
- Hector, L. The Handwriting of English Documents (Dorking, 1988)
- Heidegger, M. The Concept of Time, W. McNeill, trans. (Oxford, 1992)
- Henderson, P. 'Life at the Top' CL CLXXVII (3 Jan 1985) 6-9
- Henderson, P. 'The Loggia in Tudor and Stuart England: The Adaptation and Function of Classical Form' in Albion's Classicism Ed Gent (London & New Haven, 1995) 109-146
- Henrey, B. British Botanical and Horticultural Literature before 1800 3 vols., Vol. 1: 16th-17th Century (London, 1975)
- Hessels J. Ed. Ecclesiae Londino Batavae Archivum 2 Vols. (London, 1887)
- Hexter, J. H. 'The Education of the Aristocracy in the Renaissance', Journal of Modern History 22 (1950), 1-20
- Higgins, A. 'On the work of Florentine sculptors in England in the Early Part of the Sixteenth Century. With special reference to the tombs of Cardinal Wolsey and Henry VIII', AJ 51 (1894), 129-220
- Higgott G. 'Varying with Reason: Inigo Jones Theory of design' AH 35 (1992) 51-77

- Higham, C.S. Wimbleton Manor under the Cecils (London, 1962)
- Hind, A.M. Engraving in England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Vol, 1: The Tudor Period (Cambridge, 1952)
- HMC Reports (London) (Individual vols. cited as applicable)
- Hollstein, F. German Engravings, Etchings & Woodcuts, c 1400-1700 Vol. IV (Amsterdam, [1949-])
- Howard, M. The Early Tudor Country House: Architecture and Politics 1490-1550 (London, 1987)
- Howard, M. 'The Ideal House and Healthy Life: the Origins of Architectural Theory in England' in Guillaume & Chastel Eds (Paris, 1988)
- Howard, M. "'His Lordship was the Chiefest Architect" : Patrons as Builders in 16th-Century England" in The Role of the Amateur Architect Ed. G. Worsley (Georgian Group Symposium 1993)
- Howard, M. 'Hospitality and Lodging in Sixteenth-Century England: the Evidence of the Drawings of John Thorpe' Architecture et Vie Sociale, Ed. Guillaume (1994), 257-268
- Howarth, D. Lord Arundel and His Circle (London, 1985)
- Howartson, C. & I. Chilvers Eds The Concise Oxford Companion to Classical Literature (Oxford, 1993)

- Hudson, W. The Cambridge Connection and the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559 (Durham, 1980)
- Hurstfield, J. 'Lord Burghley as Master of the Court of Wards' Trans. RHS 4th Series XXXI (1949) 95-114
- Hurstfield, J. & A. Smith, Eds Documents in Modern History: Elizabethan People (London, 1972)
- Hussey, C. 'Burghley House', CL CXIV (3, 10, 17, 24, 31 Dec.1953) Pt I, 1828-1832, Pt II, 1962-1965, Pt III 2038-2041, Pt IV, 2104-2107, Pt V, 2164-2167
- Ives, E. & J. Scarisbrick, Eds Wealth & Power in Tudor England (London, 1978)
- Jackson-Stops, G. & J. Pipkin The English Country House. A Grand Tour (London, 1985)
- Jacques, D & A. van der Host et al. The Gardens of William and Mary (London, 1988)
- Jayne, S. Library Catalogues of the English Renaissance (Berkeley, 1965)
- Jeannevet, M. A Feast of Words. Banquets & Table-Talk in the Renaissance (Cambridge, 1991)
- Johnson, P. Elizabeth I. A Study in Power and Intellect (London, 1988)
- Jourdain, M. English Decorative Plasterwork of the Renaissance (London, 1926)
- Kendrick, T. British Antiquity (London, 1950)

- Kennedy, M. 'The Central Government and Local Interest: Carlton and the Gentlemen of South Holland', Historical Journal vol. 26, 1 (1983), 15-37
- Kent, F.W. A Florentine Patrician & his Palace (London, 1981)
- Kip, W. Britannia Illustrata (London, 1707)
- Kipling, G. The Triumph of Honour. Burgundian Origins of the Elizabethan Renaissance (Leiden, 1977)
- King's Works This abbreviation is used frequently in the text, referring to The History of the King's Works, Ed.. H. Colvin et al vol. III: 1485-1660 (part I) (London, 1975), vol. IV: 1485-1660 (part II) (London, 1982), listed above under Colvin's works
- Koenigsberger, H.G. & G. L. Mosse & G. Q. Bowler Europe in the Sixteenth Century (London, 1989)
- Leatham, V. Burghley. The Life of a Great House (London, 1992)
- Leslie, M. 'An English Landscape Garden before "The English Landscape Garden"?', Journal of Garden History Vol 3 (1983)
- Lewis, D. 'Patterns of Preference: Patronage of Sixteenth-Century Architects by the Venetian Patriciate', Patronage in the Renaissance, Eds G. Fitch Lyle & S. Orgel, (Princeton, NJ, 1981)
- Lewis, E.W.S. Ed. Horace Walpole's Correspondence 38 Vols. (London, 1937-74)

- Lindley, P., Ed. Gainsborough Old Hall (Lincoln, 1991)
- Lloyd, N. A History of the English House (London, 1931)
- Long, E.T. 'Bisham Abbey', CL LXXXIX (12, 19 & 26 April 1941), 320-324, 342-346, 364-368
- Looper, M. 'Political Messages in the Medici Palace Garden', Journal of Garden History Vol 12 No 4 (1992), 255-268
- MacCaffrey, W. 'Place and Patronage in Elizabethan Politics' in Elizabethan Government and Society Bindoff Ed. et al (London, 1961)
- Maladorno, A. 'I Cecil e lo Studio Patavino' Quaderni per la Storia Dell'Universita di Padova Vol 16 (1983) 119-126
- Marshall, P. 'The Archaeological Survey at Wollaton Hall: some Revelations' in The Tudor and Jacobean Great House Ed. M. Airs (Oxford, 1994)
- McClung, W. The Country House in English Renaissance Poetry (London, 1977)
- McClure, P.
& R. Headlan Wells 'Elizabeth I as a second Virgin Mary' Renaissance Studies Vol 4 No 1 (1990) 38-70
- McGrath, A.E. Reformation Thought (Oxford, 1993)
- Maguire, A. & A. Gomme 'Who needs two Kitchens?' AH Vol 38, (1995) 58-68
- McKean, J. 'Sebastiano Serlio', Architectural Assoc. Quarterly 11 no 4 (1979), 14-27

- Mellows, W.T., Ed. et al 'Tudor Documents II',
Northamptonshire Records Society
Vol XIII (1939)
- Mellows, W.T., Ed. et al 'Tudor Documents III',
Northamptonshire Records Society
Vol XVIII (1956)
- Mercer, E. English Art 1553-1625 (Oxford,
1962)
- Mignot, C. 'L'Escalier dans l'Architecture
Française: 1550-1640' (in Guillaume
& Chastel, L'Escalier dans
L'Architecture de la Renaissance,
Series: 'De Architectura' (Paris, 1985),
49-66
- Millar, J.F. Classical Architecture in Renaissance
Europe 1419-1585 (Williamsburg,
1987)
- Miller, A.C. Sir Henry Killigrew (London 1963)
- Mordaunt Crook, J. 'Architecture and History' AH (1984)
Vol 27, 555-578
- Morris, R. K. 'Windows in Early Tudor Country
Houses' in Early Tudor England Ed D.
Williams (Woodbridge 1989) 125-
138
- Morton, J. A Natural History of
Northamptonshire (London, 1712)
- Mowl, T. Elizabethan & Jacobean Style
(London, 1993)
- Nash, J. Mansions of England in the Olden
Time (London, 1849)

- Newman, J. 'The development of the staircase in Elizabethan and Jacobean England' (in Guillaume & Chastel, 1985), 175-178
- Newman, J. 'Inigo Jones' Architectural Education before 1614' AH 35 (1992) 18-50
- Nicolas, N. Memoirs of the Life and Times of Sir Christopher Hatton (London, 1847)
- Nichols, J. The Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth 4 vols. (first Edition London, 1788-1821)
- Nichols, J. Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth 3 vols. (London, 1823)
- Nichols, J. The Progresses and Public Processions of King James I 4 vols. (London, 1828)
- Nichols, J. 'Theobalds Palace' Gentleman's Magazine. Vol 106 pt i, 1836, 147-154
- Norbrook, D. Poetry and Politics in the English Renaissance (London, 1984)
- Onians, J. Bearers of Meaning: The Classical Orders in Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance (Princeton, 1988)
- Parker, M. 'Correspondence of Archbishop Parker' Parker Society (1853)
- Peck, F. Desiderata Curiosa 2 vols., Ed. T. Evans (London, 1732-5)
- Penner, R. Conference Centre Design (London, 1991)

- Pettit, P. 'The Royal Forests Of Northamptonshire 1558-1714', Northants Record Soc. Vol XXIII (1968)
- Pevsner, N. An Outline of European Architecture (Harmondsworth, 1985; 1st Pub. 1943)
- Pevsner, N. 'Old Somerset House', AR 116 (1954),163-67
- Pevsner, N., Ed. The Buildings of England (Harmondsworth, as dated) Buckinghamshire (1960); Bedforshire, Huntingdon, and Peterborough (1968); Cambridgeshire, 2nd Ed. (1970); Northamptonshire, 2nd Ed. revised by B. Cherry (1973; 1st Pub., 1961); Hertfordshire, 2nd Ed. revised by B. Cherry (1977)
- Pevsner, N. & J. Harris The Buildings of England, Lincolnshire (1964)
- Pevsner, N. The Englishness of English Art (London, 1988; 1st Pub. 1956)
- Phillips, G.W. Lord Burghley in Shakespeare (London, 1936)
- Platt, C. National Trust Guide to Late Medieval and Renaissance Britain (London, 1986)
- Platt, C. The Great Rebuilding of Tudor and Stuart England (London, 1994)
- Plowden, A. The Elizabethan Secret Service (New York, 1991)
- Porter, H. Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge (Hamden, Conn.,1972)

- Powers, A. 'Anything but Boring' The Spectator (16 Jan 1993), 44
- Pratt, M. Great Country Houses of Central Europe (London, 1991)
- Pullan, B. Crisis and Change in the Venetian Economy in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century (London, 1968)
- Quaintance, R. 'Walpole's Whig Interpretation of Landscape History', Studies in 18th Century Culture Vol 9 (1979), 289-300
- Quinones, R.J. The Renaissance Discovery of Time (Harvard, 1972)
- RCHME The Town of Stamford. An Inventory of Historical Monuments (London, 1977)
- RCHME City of York 5 Vols, Vol. 4 (London, 1975)
- RCHME An Inventory of the Historical Monuments in the County of Northamptonshire, 3 Vols
Vol. 3: Archaeological Sites in North-West Northamptonshire (London, 1981)
- Read, C. Mr Secretary Cecil and Queen Elizabeth (London, 1955)
- Read, C. 'Lord Burghley's Household Accounts', Economic History Review 2nd Series Vol. IX (1956), 343-8
- Read, C. Lord Burghley and Queen Elizabeth (London, 1960)

- Richarson, M. 'A 'fair' drawing: A little-known Adam design for Burghley', Apollo (August 1992), 87-88
- Rogers, J. 'The Manner Houses of Gorhambury', St Albans & Herts. Architectural and Archaeological Soc. New Series 4 (1933-5), 35-115
- Rohde, E.S. The Old English Gardening Books (London, 1924)
- Rohde, E.S. The Story of the Garden (London, 1989; 1st Pub. 1932)
- Rosand, D. Painting in Cinquecento Venice: Titian, Veronese, Tintoretto (New Haven, 1982)
- Rowse, A. L. The England of Elizabeth: The Structure of Society (London, 1950)
- Rowse, A.L. 'Alltyrynys and the Cecils', EHR LXXV (1960), 54-76
- Rowse, A.L. The England of Elizabeth: The Cultural Achievement (London, 1972)
- Rye, W. England as Seen by Foreigners (London, 1865)
- Salzman, L. F. Building in England down to 1540 (Oxford, 1992; 1st Pub. 1952)
- Saumarez Smith, C. The Building of Castle Howard (London, 1990)
- Schama, S. Landscape and Memory (London, 1995)
- Schever, M. The Legends of Troy in Art and Literature (London, 1964)

- Sharpe, K. & P. Lake, Eds Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England (London, 1994)
- Shearman, J. Mannerism (Harmondsworth, 1984: first publishEd, 1967)
- Shepherd, S. Spenser (London, 1989)
- Schiavo, R. A Guide to the Olympic Theatre trans. A. Hill (Vicenza, 1987)
- Shirley, E.P. Some Account of English Deer Parks (London, 1867)
- Short Title Catalogue of Books PrintEd in England 1475-1650 2 Vols Eds A. Pollard & G. Redgrave, rev. Ed. Ed. A. Jackson (London, 1976)
- Simpson, R. 'Sir Thomas Smith and the Wall Paintings at Hill Hall, Essex: Scholarly Theory and Design in the Sixteenth Century', BAAJ CXXX (1977), 1-20
- Simpson, W. D. 'Dudley Castle, the Renaissance Buildings' AJ CI (1944) 119-125
- Skelton R., & J. Summerson, Eds A Description of the Maps and Architectural Drawings in the Collection made by William Cecil, First Baron Burghley, now at Hatfield House (Roxburghe Club, 1971)
- Skelton, R. Saxton's Survey of England and Wales (Amsterdam, 1974)
- Slade, G. 'Broughton Castle, Oxfordshire' AJ 135 (1978), 138-194

- Sladen, T. 'The Garden at Kirby Hall 1570-1700', Garden History Vol 4 No 2 (1984), 139-156
- Slavin, A.J. Politics and Profit. A Study of Sir Ralph Sadler 1507-47 (Cambridge, 1966)
- Smith, A.G. The Emergence of a Nation State: The Commonwealth of England 1529-1660 (London and New York, 1984)
- Smith, B. R. 'Landscape with Figures: The Three Realms of Queen Elizabeth's Country-house Revels', Renaissance Drama Vol. 8 (1977), 57-115
- Smith, J.T. English Houses 1200-1800. The Hertfordshire Evidence (London, 1992)
- Smuts, M. 'The Political Failure of Stuart Cultural Patronage' in Patronage in the Renaissance, Eds G. Fitch Lyle, & S. Orgel (Princeton, NJ, 1981) 165-187
- Sohn, P. 'The State and Domestic Staircase in Venetian Society' in Guillaume & Chastel, L'Escalier dans L'Architecture de la Renaissance, Series: 'De Architectura' (Paris, 1985), 123-132
- Somerset, A. Elizabeth I (London, 1991)
- Stalleybrass, B. 'Bess of Hardwick's buildings & building accounts' Arch LXIV (1913)
- Stanley-Millson, C.
& J. Newman 'The Building of a Jacobean Mansion' AH 29 (1986), 1-42

- Starkey, D. 'The Court: Castiglione's Ideal & Tudor Reality', WCJ 45 (1982), 232-239
- Starkey, D. 'Ightham Mote: Politics and Architecture in early Tudor England', Arch 107 (1981), 153-163
- Starkey, D., Ed. The English Court (London, 1993; 1st Pub. 1987)
- Steane, J. 'The Development of Tudor and Stuart Garden Design in Northamptonshire', Northants. Past & Present Vol. V, No. 5 (1977), 383-406
- St John Hope, W. Windsor Castle 2 vols & portfolio (London 1913)
- Stone, L. 'The Building of Hatfield House', A.J. CXII (1955), 100-128
- Stone, L. An Elizabethan, Sir Horatio Palavicino (Oxford, 1956)
- Stone, L. The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641 (Oxford, 1965)
- Stone, L. & J. Fawtier-Stone An Open Elite? England 1540-1880 (Oxford, 1984)
- Strong, R. & J. van Dorsten Leicester's Triumphs (Leiden & London, 1964)
- Strong, R. The English Icon (London, 1969)
- Strong, R. Splendour at Court: Renaissance Spectacle & the Theatre of Power (London, 1973)
- Strong, R. The Renaissance Garden in England (London, 1979)

- Strong, R. Gloriana: The Portraits of Queen Elizabeth I (New York, 1987)
- Stroud, D. Capability Brown (London, 1950)
- Summerson, J. 'John Thorpe and the Thorpes of Kingscliffe', AR, CVI (1949), 291-300
- Summerson, J. 'Three Elizabethan Architects', Bull. John Rylands Library Vol XL i (1957), 202-228
- Summerson, J. 'The Building of Theobalds', Arch XCVII (1959), 107-126
- Summerson, J. Ed. 'The Book of Architecture of John Thorpe', Walpole Society XL (1966)
- Summerson, J. The Classical Language of Architecture (new edition, 1980; 1st Pub. London, 1964)
- Summerson, J. Architecture in Britain 1530-1830 (Harmondsworth, 1986; 1st Pub. 1953)
- Tafuri, M. Venice and the Renaissance (London, 1989)
- Tennenhouse, L. Power on Display (London, 1986)
- Thomas, K. Religion and the Decline of Magic (Harmondsworth, 1985; 1st Pub. 1971)
- Thomas, K. Man and the Natural World (Harmondsworth, 1987; 1st Pub. 1983)
- Thompson, M.W. Kenilworth Castle An English Heritage Guide Book (London, 1987)
- Thomson, D. Renaissance Paris (London, 1987)

- Thomson, D. Renaissance Architecture, Critic, Patron, Luxury (Manchester, 1993)
- Thomson, D. 'France's Earliest Illustrated Architectural Pattern Book: Designs for living à la française of the 1540s', Architecture et Vie Sociale, Ed. Guillaume (1994), 221-234
- Thomson, W. G. A History of Tapestry (Wakefield, 1973)
- Thurley, S. The Royal Palaces of Tudor England (New Haven & London, 1993)
- Till, E. 'Capability Brown at Burghley', CL CLVIII (16 Oct., 1975), 982-985
- Till, E. 'The Development of the Park and Garden at Burghley', Garden History Vol 19 no 2 (1991), 128-145
- Tittler, R. Nicholas Bacon. The Making of a Tudor Statesman (London, 1976)
- Trevor Roper, H. 'Queen Elizabeth's First Historian', Neale Lectures in English History (London, 1971)
- Turner, R. The Vision of Landscape in Renaissance Italy (Princeton, 1966)
- van Dorsten, J.A. Poets, Patrons & Professors (London, 1962)
- van Dorsten, J.A. 'Mr. Secretary Cecil, Patron of Letters' English Studies No 50 (1969), 545-553

- van Dorsten, J.A. 'Literary Patronage in Elizabethan England: The Early Phase', Patronage in the Renaissance, Eds G. Fitch Lyle & S. Orgel (Princeton, NJ, 1981), 191-206
- von Bartch, J. Le Peintre Graveur 21 Vols (Leipzig, 1854-76)
- VCH Berkshire 4 vols. Eds P.H.Ditchfield & W.Page (London,1906-1924)
- VCH Hertfordshire 4 vols. Ed. W.Page (London, 1902-1914)
- VCH Northamptonshire 4 vols. Eds W.Ryland, D.Adkins & R.Serjeantson (Vols. 1&2), W. Page (Vol. 3), L.F.Salzman (Vol. 4) (London,1906-1937)
- Waddy, P. Use and the Art of the Plan (New York, 1990)
- Waddy, P. 'The Roman Apartment from the Sixteenth to the Seventeenth Century' in J. Guillaume Ed. 1994, 155-166
- Walker, G. & M. Moore, Eds Sir Philip Sidney and the Interpretation of Elizabethan Culture (London, 1984)
- Walpole, H. Anecdotes of Painting in England 3 vols., Ed. Ralph Wornum (London, 1849)
- Walpole, H. Horace Walpole's Correspondence 38 vols., Ed. W.S. Lewis (1937-74)

- Walpole, H. 'Journal of Visits to Country Seats', Walpole Society XVI (1927-28; written 1751-1784)
- Warnicke, R.M. Women of the English Renaissance and Reformation (London, 1983)
- Weiss, R. The Renaissance Discovery of Classical Antiquity (Oxford, 1969)
- Whinney, M. Sculpture in Britain 1530-1830 (London, 1964)
- White, A. 'Tudor Classicism', AR 171 (June, 1982), 52-56
- Williams, F. Index of Dedications (London, 1962)
- Wilson, E.C. England's Eliza (London, 1966)
- Wilson, J. Entertainments for Elizabeth I (Woodbridge, 1980)
- Wilson, J. 'The Harefield Entertainment and the Cult of Elizabeth I' Antiq. Jnl Vol (1986) 315-329, vol. 66.
- Wittkower, R. Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism (London, 1988)
- Wood, M. The English Mediaeval House (London, 1985)
- Woodward, D. Men at Work : Labourers and building craftsmen in the towns of northern England, 1450-1750 (Cambridge 1995)
- Worsley, G. 'Paco Ducal de Vila Viçosa' CL December 19, (1991), 40-43
- Wundram, M. & Pape, T. Palladio (Köln 1992)
- Yates, F. Theatre of the World (London, 1969)

- Yates, F. The Occult Philosophy in the Elizabethan Age (London, 1979)
- Yates, F. Astrea (London, 1985; 1st Pub. 1975)

4. UNPUBLISHED THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

- Henderson, P. The Visual Setting of the Tudor and Stuart House (Unpublished PhD Thesis Courtauld Institute of Art, 1992)
- Howard, M. The Domestic Building Patronage of the Courtiers of Henry VIII (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Courtauld, London, 1985)
- Laven, P.J. Daniele Barbaro Patriarch Elect of Aquileia with Special Ref. to his Circle of Scholars & his Literary Achievement (Unpublished PhD Thesis, London, 1957)
- Sandeen, E. The Building Activities of Sir Nicholas Bacon (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Chicago, 1959)
- Starr, M. England's Lost Renaissance? (Unpublished 2nd Year Thesis AA Building Conservation Course, 1991)
- Thurley, S. English Royal Palaces 1450-1550 (Unpublished PhD Thesis, London, 1991)
- Turquet, J.C. The Inner Court of Nonsuch Palace (Unpublished PhD Thesis, London, 1983)

OTHER UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Cambridge County Council SMR References Archaeological
Database (current, Cambridge)

Northamptonshire County Council Archaeology Geophysical Survey
at Burghley House, Stamford, October
1993 (February 1994)

RCHME

Unpublished Reports on Houses in
North Northamptonshire, preparEd
for forthcoming RCHME volume, held
in the NBR Files (within the files for
individual houses)

Wilson, A.

Record of Association with Burghley
House 3 vols., Unpublished MSS
compiled by the honorary architect
of Burghley House (1982-1994)

EXPLANATORY INTRODUCTION TO APPENDICES

In Appendix A are a series of letters and one account, first transcribed and published by Gotch in 1890. Appendix B consists of transcriptions of hitherto unpublished material. This includes a schedule of items for the freemasons, prepared by Cecil in 1558, and written in his own hand, henceforward referred to as the "Schedule for the Masons" or the "Masons' Schedule". There is also a two-page paper entitled "Memorial" on one page and "Remembrance" on the other (the former has half a page of further items on its reverse side). These lists of general tasks to be attended to at Burghley are also in Cecil's hand. Both sheets are calendared together in the State Papers for 1561, but almost certainly they constitute a running document written as a reminder for himself over a period of time up to 1561. Indeed they were formerly calendared for 1559. Some of the items on the 'Memorial' page have been crossed through, while others are repeated on both sheets, suggesting they were still live matters. Henceforward, this document is referred to as "the Memorial". A letter to Cecil from John Norris from Burghley 15 May 1556 in the Hatfield papers and extracts from a report by Sir John Abraham complete Appendix B. Quotations from unpublished documents that are cited less frequently are printed only in the text.

In some cases spellings have been modernized and abbreviations commonly used by Cecil and others transcribed in full. This is done for the sake of clarity. Where this has been done it is marked at the top of each document. Where there is some doubt as to a word in the original text a [?] has been inserted after the transcription.

400

APPENDIX A

Letter 1 SP Dom 11/9/94

Ryght worshypfull my dewty Remeberyd thys shalbe to advertyse yow that
 I dowe understand youre plesewre ys to have iij lukon wyndows for youre
 inercowrt but I canot understand by Johne nores after what sort yow wolde
 5 have them but as I dowe understand by hys talkeyng yow dowe intend to have
 them after the same molds that the beye wyndowe ys mayd by, but whether
 yow dowe thynke to have them of the same wyde that hyt ys or not I cane nott
 telle, therfore I shall dyssyer yowe to drawe yowre menynges how and after
 10 what facyon yowe wolde have them to be made in all poynts bothe the wyde of
 the lyght and allsoe the heght of the same, wythe the fassyon of all the molds
 thatt dowthe belonge there vnto and in what plaice ye wolde have them to
 stande, and yower plessewre knowne I shall dowe the best y^t lyethe in me to
 dowe . I wold be verye glade to knowe yowre plessewre for yore sters forthe
 15 of yowre basse kowrt up to the tares [terrace] and for the proporcion of them
 and allso for the gatte att the ende of ye tares wythe the proporcion of the same
 bothe for the heght and wydthe that yow wolde have theme of I wolde gladlye
 understande youre mynde after what facion yow wolde have the gabyllende
 over the lucan wyndow therefore I shar dyssyer yowe to drawe a tryke of the
 upryght for youre lucan wyndowe and the gabyll end over hytt that I ma the
 20 better understande yowre plessewre in all thyngs y^t ye wolde that I shulde
 dowe. I thynges yowre owne stone ys to soft for to make any sters of hytt the
 best stone y^t I dow knowe for stepe or sters ys att clypsame. the lyvynges god
 kepe yowe ever more frome all evyll & my goode Ladye w^t all y^e rest of yowre
 worshypfull howse.
 25 frome burlaye the xiiij of June. By yowre at all tyme to cōmande ROGER
 WARDE mason.

[Addressed] To the Ryght worshypfull Syr Wyll^am Cecille Knyght at the
 canan rowe in Westmynyster gyve thys wythe speyde.
 30 at London.

[Endorsed] 1556. Junij Ro. Ward.

Letter 2 SP Dom 11/9/94

My duetie considered & most humbly promised to yo^r maistershype beyng
 verye sorye to und^rstande y^t yo^r maistershipe is displesed for y^t yo^r buyldynges
 are in no more redines & y^e same to be judged my necligence or evell applyeng
 of yo^r workemē. I can neyther let any man to writt neyther to say y^r myndes
 5 but sure I am y^t yo^r workes are corespondente to yo^r m^rshippes charges or elles
 let it be rekened to be my fawte yee my slowthefulnes w^t yo^r mais^rnippes
 dispesure wiche I woulde not have for ye wholl borowgh of Stamford but some
 be of suche nature & so moche desire thanks y^t y^a will seke for them with
 other menes dispesores yee almost to y^r undoynges as it shulde by myn to have
 10 yo^r maistershypes dispesure I beseche god y^t I never lyve to have it I pray yo^r
 M^rshippe to pardone this my folyshe & rude talke y^t is so rashe for yo^r
 buyldynges are not so far out of order but now we havynge plast^r sex loodes
 burnt upon thursedaye last & have done y^e particion over wher yo^r skrene shall
 stande & almost yo^r pantre, & to morow m^r barteleyes tenentes bryng to
 15 Burghley all yo^r plaster y^t is at Sesterne m^r Willyams man said y^t y^r was in all
 xxxij loodes & this weke by godes grace shall y^e flores in yo^r galere be maid &
 y^e rooffe seled plast^d I shuld have said) & after other thynges with suche spede
 as may be, yo^r kechyng roiffe wyl be y^e greatest pese of worke y^t is to be done
 but we shall have this weke iij carpinters to helpe a bowte y^e same worke
 20 although workemē are dere w^c hathe partely caused me to for bere hyryng of
 workemen & agane partely because y^r m^rshipe dyd writt y^t ye purposid not to
 come to burley before y^e xvij of July & by y^t tym yo^r owne carpinters woulde
 have done those thynges y^t y^a had in charge & so to have spared some money.
 hall hathe mesured betwene yo^r hous & y^e freres cundithe with a corde of xxx
 25 yerdes in lenght & y^r is betwane yo^r hous & y^e cundith xlv cord lenththes &
 betwene yo^r house & yo^r owne cundyth xxij cord lenththes hall hathe a molde
 y^t wyll agree with yo^r pype in wydines and every yerde of his pipe wyll take of
 leade xvij^{li} and besids yo^r owne pype hall thynkyth y^t v fothers of leade wyll go
 thorow to y^e freres cundith. & hall saithe y^t he wyll do y^e workemanshippe
 30 havynge all thynges therto belongyng upon yo^r charges for xx markes &
 otherwyse he saithe he can not lyve to do it. betwene yo^r skrene & y^e halfe
 pace in yo^r hall is xx foote & ix inches & y^e table y^r is xv foote and di[medium]
 betwene y^e halfe pace & y^e dore is iij foote, y^e other side table may be ix foote
 & iij foote to spare, y^e brethe of bothe y^e tables are ij foote ij ynches and
 35 di[medium] I have talked w^t thomas lockesmyth for yo^r rackes & he saith y^t y^a
 will take iij c of yron spanyshe wiche may be had at bet^rborow of y^e best for xij
 ye c. & he wyll worke it for ij^d y^e pounce this thyng would be done but
 whether ye have provided iron or no I knowe not but I trust by this berer to
 know at his returne, thus I beseche y^e lyvyng god alweyes to rule in yo^r harte
 40 and governe yo^r mynd at burley in hast by yors to his poore power ye xiiij of
 June 1556.

ABRAHAM

45 [Addressed] To the ryght worshipfull Sir Willm Cicell knyght geve thes with
 spede.
 [Endorsed] 1556. 13 Junij Abraham.

Letter 3 SP Dom 12/20/8

at burlegh the 18. of Octob. 1561.

My dewtie to yo^r hono^r most umblye consydred I have sent ðo herin a tryck
of the brewhowse as I thynck it wold do well, & where I make ij Rowmes for
the bakehowse & mylne, ðo may have more howses of the same Rowme for to
5 make yo^r corne chambers of, for yo^r workes the quarye in the garden gothe on
as faste as may be the Range wall to the Courte is up to the flore the cornar
stones of the turret y^t maketh the square is layde, the east syde wall is at the
Walke in the gutter & the lead layd therof, the Cundet howse the Ruffe is set
heygher but I have medled no further w^t it for y^t I wold take the advic of the
10 plomer w^c is not yet come, but when he cometh yo^r adiç [?advic]) therin, ðo
shalbe answered, the east wall of the terras in the garden is so heyh as the
quarter y^t is made of the garden. I have clensyd the hedge ronde abowte the
orchard the prest wyll not open the grownd in dyvers places of the orchard, for
y^t he saythe the holes wyll stand full of water do what he can, the be walnot set
15 a good sort the hall is halfe selyd w^t plaster over the head w^c shewthe vere
fayre, I thynck it good to lay the flore over the pantre somewhat hegher than the
flore of my ladyes chamber, for when yo shall inlaye the lytle parlar as yo must
nedes then of nesessitie yo must reyse y^t flore I pray yo let me know yo^r plesur
herin shortlye becawse it is in hande precēlye [presently] the name of the mason
I wryt to yo of is Thomas Hatcher dwell at ruskome iij myles frome Reyding.
20 he promest me he wold serve yo w^towt fayle, there is some store of aslar
hewen these Rayne days, the hangings y^t were wryten fore, peter canot carye
them up now onles he shold lay them apon the stoud horses, but it were better
y^t I shold bryng them when I come w^c shall be abowte martēmas god wylling.
I truste yo^r hono^r wyl be my good Master for the leas of the farme of Coltneyt
25 the quenes Rentes shal be payd acording to yo^r Comādmēt god wylling who
preserve yo^r hona^r in all prosperitie bothe of bodie & soule amen.

by yo^r umble servant

PETER KEMP.

30 my L.of Rutland was at burlegh of Wedynsday laste. the ayre of Hargraves
axe thane ijc markes save fyve for his entrest of the lands in Stamford.

[Adressed] To the Ryght hon^{able} and my syngular good M^r Sir W^m Cecil
knyght pryncepsall secretorie to the quenes ma^{ty} geve this w^t
sped.

35 [Endorsed] 18 Octob. 1561. Peter Kemp.

Letter 4 SP Dom 12/20/8

at burlegh the 3. of Novēb. 1561.

My dewtie to yo^r hona^r moost umble consydred I have recyved yo^r letters of
the 21. & 23. of october, for yo^r brewhowse & the other howses there standing
must nedes Rawnge as apearethe by the platt but not so narow in the west end
as the platt shewthe they wyll not stand so in syght y^t skylle for y^t, for the water
5 I wyll undertake y^t the stable shall not corrupt it, I wyll turne it so frome the
course y^t it hethe now, the quarry in the garden is at the dore y^t leadethe thorow
by the parlar dore into the gardyn, for the water in the condit howse when the
ploñer is come my advic is, y^t the pipe y^t comethe from the head, shall rune up
by a poste tyll it come to the toppe of the howse, & there retorne down upon the
10 mydest of the table into a basen acording to a tryck I heve made to shew ðo the
manner therof it is not vary syghtlye for y^t I ame not coning in drawing, the
hangings shal be sent up as shortlye as I can possyble, it was not my dede they
came not, but other carege, I have begune the quicke setting of the grownd, and
mean to lett the reste by great I do not prosed after the tryck I sent ðo for y^t I se
15 I shall lose the vantage of the bancke yf it shold not ryse betwext the hedges
becawse on the top I wyll sette a dead hedge, y^t ðo shall precentlye put in yo^r
dear, & y^t dead hedge shal be a fene for ix or x yers, & the heyght frome the
playne gronde to the toppe of the dead hedge s ix fote, holye wyll not be strong
Inough for a hedge of it selfe, but I have determyned so farr as I cane get holye
20 Inogh, to make ij Rawes of thorne and the therd of holye, w^c shal be on the
insyde of the walke, and to be above all the Rent of the hedge, yf it shold be on
the owte syde to the close y^t the dear myght com to it it wole as I thynck rather
occasyon the dear to be bese [busy] w^t it to the hurt of all the hedge, but it
apering above all the hedge ever opene wyll do fayre Inough I fear I shall not
25 spare ðo anye some of money to the purpas for yf I do I muste borow agayne,
my M^{rs} ðo^r mother wyll take her Journey towards ðo the x. or xi. daye of this
monethe so sone as I may speke w^t thomas burtū and lowyck I shall sertifye ðo
what fowle ðo shall truste to, I have not further to trobe ðo w^t at this tyme but
the lyving god be yo^r defender amen.

30 by yo^r umble servant
PETER KEMP.

[Addressed] To the Ryght hon^rable and my syngular good M^r Sir W^m Cecill
35 knyght pryncipall secretory to the quenes ma^{ty} geve this w^t
sped.

[Endorsed] 3 Nov. 1561 Peter Kemp to my m^r

Letter 5 SP Dom 12/20/8

The Surveyors byll.

Delivered To John Mounte for ye use of M^r Secretorie Cecilles The parcells followinge }
 Imprimis for xliij^{no}₁ of bricke at vij^s the m^l delivered at y^e kill-xv^{li} xij^d for ij } xlvj^{li}
 loade di. of Lath at xvij^s y^e loade-xlv^s for xvij loade of timber at xj^s ye loade- } iij^svij^d
 ixⁱⁱ vij^s for v^c of q^rtirbourd at iij^s vij^d ye C.-xvii^s iij^d for v^{ml} vij^c of plaunchbourd }
 5 at iij^s ye C.-xj^{li} viij^s for xxxvij loade of Tallwood at iij^s vij^d y^e load- vj^{li} xvij^s }
 iij^d for iij bushells of whiet plaister at xvij^d ye bushell-vj^s- }

[dorso] Leade delyvered to the Sergeaunt plōmer as followeth

Inprimis the xth dai of marche 1560 fyve hundrethe di xxxv^{li} of leade

Item moore delyvered the same dai fyve hundrethe fyve & twenty pounce of

10 Lead.

Letter 6 SP Dom 12/20/8

. . . . I dyd mak the 3 & 5 d y & sent them by p is an other fawte
 w^c we do thynck meete to be amendyd y^t is the grownd table wold be suncke
 downe lower by 2 fote di. or els yo^r open galary wyll doe ðo lytle plesuer for at
 the present ðo can skase standing wthin loke into the garden over the soyle of
 5 the bay wyndow it may be wyll suffred to syncke where the frese co^rnishe &
 arcatrave dothe & no fowle syght but rather a bewte M^r Cave is at Stamford at
 this precent, my m^{rs} yo^r mother is mere [merry] god be thanked. I have not
 further to troble ðo w^t but o^r blessyd Lorde presarve ðo in helthe & hona^r amen.
 by yo^r umble servant

PETER KEMPE.

[Endorsed] 8 May 1562
 Peter Kempe.

[Addressed] To the Ryght hon^rable and my syngular good M^r Sir W^m Cecill,
 &c.

Letter 7 SP Dom 12/20/8

at burlegh the 16. of Maye 1562.

My dewtie to yo^r hona^r moste umble consydred I have receyved yo^r letter
 frome M^r Wyngfyld w^t the indentur & a cote clothe I know not for whome, yo^r
 masons sence they came have ben yet hetherto onestlye occupied in making
 5 reyde of suche stone as is nedfull furste to be ocupied I have sent ŷo herin a
 note of the mesner of Wortherp, the thyng is noysed abrode in the contrey
 alreyde & sutors for it to have some promesse of the farmes I thyncke yf ŷo
 wyll there wyl be as muche money geven as wyll bulde the fore farmes mare I
 fear ŷo must lose some of the Rent ŷo now receive for it for the psonage of
 10 Leffnam I have hadd talke w^t a lerned man who is Chansler to my lorde of
 Peterborow he is bothe sober wyse well lerned & hathe a goodlye trade in
 teching & delygent therin his name is m^r antonye awse it is neygh my
 lorde he wyl be content to be bonde to dwell upon it & if it plesse ŷo to admyt
 hym he is a man may do muche good in the contrey w^t his preching I have told
 15 hym y^t ŷo wold be content to bestow it of suche a man condyssonely y^t he
 shold d it we have not the lyke man in all o^r contrey saving my L.
 bysshop. for the falling of the grond table it is not ment otherwyse then those
 too plases where the pillers do stand the bay wyndow to be as it is w^c is 4 fote
 to the leyning plac the Rugh mason are makyng of a hoggs cote where apon the
 20 water w^c rones apon the est syde therof I do set a howse of offece w^t an entre y^t
 shall come in betwext the hoggs cote & the slaughterhowse. I have not further
 to troble ŷo w^t at this precent but holygoste preserve ŷo in helthe & hono^r &
 sende ŷo sone into the Contry amen.

by yo^r umble servant

PETER KEMPE.

25

[Addressed] To the Ryght hono^rble and my syngular good M^r Sir W^m Cecill.

Letter 8 SP Dom 12/20/8

at burlegh y^e 10. of Januarye 1562.

My dewtie to yo^r hono^r moost umblye consydred I sent ðo an answar to M^r Conyers letter by y^e post aboute new yeres even. for those Rentes ðo wryte for for stamford I did not understand that ðo payd y^e quenes ma^{ty} a Rent forth of it yf I hadd it shold not have benn unpayd but hence furthe I shall see it payd to
 5 the Receyvors for other Rentes, bothe Cayworthe and y^e bayliffe of Cesterton have sent up with this berar Peter. for y^e strangers so farr as I do parsayve by them they lyk the towne & y^e frear howse well inough I have spoken w^t the alderman & some of the bretherne to lerne there good wylls therin, but what
 10 answar I shall have as yet I knowe not by y^e next ðo shall understand, ðo were not best loke for anye great sume of money by them to be lent more then the Comen Stocke which is not above iij^{xx} xli ðo must devyce other orders amongst them then are yet anye ther or yo^r labor shalbe loste and the strangers shall do no comoditie to the towne nor them selves, I wryt to know yo^r plesure whether
 15 ðo wold y^e ij quarters on y^e est side of y^e garden shall be layd levell with y^e west syde or no y^e charges wylbe great & it wold do fayre inogh yf they lye as they dow. my m^{rs} yo^r mother is mere [merry] god be thanckyd I have not further to troble ðo with but y^e holy gost be yo^r governor. for y^e Rent of barodon y^e baylyffe hathe at this precent delyverd it to peter lykwyse. yo^r workmen y^t be this day at burlegh be one fremason y^t was hyred by y^e yere
 20 working apon ye ij wyndowes in y^e insyde of y^e Courte also Combrell & his boy w^{ch} be laying a gutter for y^e water to ronne downe y^e myds of y^e garden for y^e watring thereof therbe also xvij labrars whereof ij be thresshers & ij do plant & set & xiiij be working in y^e garden which is a sore work. I must have one or
 25 ij other to Reyse freston.

yo^r umble servant

PETER KEMP.

I loke for answar frome ðo whether ðo have spoken to my L. of Hunton for Sir Thomas nevell his nettes.

30 [Addressed] To y^e Ryght hon^rable and my syngular good M^r W^m Cecill.
 [Endorsed] x^o January 1562. Peter Kemp.

Letter 9 SP Dom 12/20/8

It may please youe to vnderstande that accordinge to yo^r requeste I have bene
 at Burley and have conferred wth Kempe & Norris accordinge to yor pleasure to
 me declared' ,I assure youe I take yor determinacon for the staires to alter into
 the Chappell shall do verie well, w^{ch} alter will not be past ij foote di. in the
 5 nether ende of the Chappell, by occasion whereof I doubte not but youe will
 like the proportion of yor chamber much the better, to passe cleane thorough to
 the maine wall of the hall, and a Portall to rise before the dore : To leave a half
 pase betwene the hall and the Chamber of iiij^{or} foote di. it wolde be to litle
 purpose, and yet it wolde be a great blemishe to yor chamber to take so much in
 10 length. ffor though the portall risinge in the midst of yo^r chamber, takinge at
 the least iiij^{or} foote d^l yet notwthstandinge it will bewtifie yor chamber beinge
 well wrought and the romes on both the sides will serve for good purposes.
 But if the Portall might be placed in the side corner of the Chamber, it wold
 stande much more apter then in the midst : on the East side of yor chamber it
 15 can not stande, because the dore wold spoile the side of the hall, where the
 longe borde shoulde stande, and on the West side of it, it will take half the
 windowe in the chamber, w^{ch} may be borne, but the dore standinge against the
 end of the high table in the hall, will pester yor dore, except youe do apoint the
 shorter table to serve that place. Youe may consider of it as to youe shall seme
 20 best, and so to be followed accordingly, youe shall finde that the breadth of the
 Chamber will beare the whole length very well. And accordinge to your minde
 Kempe will provide as many Masons as he canne gett, so as the south side of
 yor house may be perfected before winter, w^{ch} is a great pece of worke to cutte
 out of yor harde stone to shortlie. I have advised Kempe to make a profe of v
 25 foote square, what the chardges wilbe, to take y^e grounde out of yor garden to
 the loones [lowness] of the flower in yor lower gallerie, so as you may have an
 estimate of the rest for that yor tarresses be alredie set forth and the stoone work
 of a great part of them done thei will take litle more earth then alreadie is
 bestowed of them. But for y^e bestowinge of yor earth, if it shall seme to youe
 30 so good, I thincke the angell of yor orcharde, w^{ch} lieth of the west side of yor
 garden, & on the south side of yor base courte, w^{ch} grownde hath a great
 dessent, w^{ch} dessent beginneth about xxx^{te} foote from the wall of the base
 courte, to the end of the wall of the garden. My mind is for to spend the earth
 that shall come out of yor garden, I wolde have a wall to goe from the rounde
 35 mounte of the south west corner of yor garden. Westwarde to the water, to be
 even with the height of the grounde adjoyninge upon the wall of yor base courte
 and so to make all that Angell levell, to use as to youe shall seme good. And if
 the earth that cometh out of the garden will not suffise to make the lower parte
 equall to the higher, as it is this present the higher parte maye be cast downe to
 40 the lower w^{ch} is no great chardge. and so it will awnswere the better wth the
 flower of yor garden. Thus beinge bolde to write to youe my minde w^{ch} as I
 thinke shal be as well a beutifying to yor orcharde to geve it an even head before
 yor house, as to the beutifying of the growndes, next adjoyninge to the
 principall side of yor house to be even and levell, howsoever it shall please
 45 youe to use it. fforther herein at this tyme I have not to say : but from tyme to
 tyme as occasion shall serve, I shal be glad to do my dever to the uttermost of
 my power to do youe & yors any pleasure or service I shal be able. [Then
 follows other matter not relating to the building.]

Written from Greatforde the xxxth day of August 1564.

Yours to cōmaund

EDMUND HALL.

[Addressed] To the honourable Sir Willm Cecill Knyghte.

[Endorsed] 30 Aug 1564. Mr Edmund Hall to my M^r

Letter 10 SP Dom 12/20/8

My duetie moost humbly remembred. It maie please yor L. to knowe that the wekely paie of all sortes of woorkmen nowe at Burghley cometh to xj^{ti} and thereabouts, and there be no moe in woork then of necessitie must nedes be to performe those works yor L. did appointe, and yet as the same ende I doe
 5 discharge the superfluous nombre. And I hope I shall have money of yor L. owne to discharge all works now appointed betwene this and Michs.

The Mason woork at the Conduyte house is done, and the plommer is in hande therewth.

1 0 The ffret of the gallerye very neare the half therof is also done and the floore of the north ende is also shotte. The plaster woork is also doone every where unto the gallery floore. And all the woorkes of the new buildinges, except it be trifles of a masons works in settinge up certen cuppes of the vamure, are also brought doune.

1 5 The masons be in hande wth the crosse wall from the Sowth tower to the rounde there, and the dore in that wall is almoost sett up w^{ch} was made of the one half of the litle gate that stooode upon the Terrasse before the olde buyldinges, And the other side of y^t gate is reserved for the like dore to be made at the north ende of the terrasse before the house I have sent for xl^{ti} lodes more plaster. [Then follows other matter not relating to the building.]

2 0 At Staunforde the xxxth of Julye 1578.

Yor L. moost obedient servaunte

RICH : SHUTE

2 5 [Addressed] To the right Honorable his singuler good L. and M^r the L. Burghley L. highe Threr of Englande and one of the Lorde of her M^{te} privy Councill.

[Endorsed] 30. Jul. 1578. Richard Shute.

APPENDIX B

Appendix B 1

Hatfield MSS CP 2/5. (Spellings modernized)

Right worshipful good master, according to my bounden duty, I have me
 most highly recommended unto your good mastership, trusting that you and
 your good lady with all your household be in good health, which my heart
 desireth, as knoweth the Lord. The cause of this, my bold writing to you, is
 5 most instantly to desire you that whereas you did license me and my fellow
 Wescott to come to your mastership and so to other friends at Whitsuntide next,
 truth is that of late, I have received letters from my friends that willeth me to say
 to your mastership to be with them the 7th day of June, for then as I do perceive
 10 a sister of mine shall be married. Your pleasure therein had, I would be right
 glad to accomplish their desires farther I do satisfy your mastership as
 concerning your works at Burlay that is to your pantry is finished in
 timberwork with the partition above the screen and the doors in your [?].
 courtyard and the floors over the dry larder, where your steps be appointed, are
 15 raised up there lacketh between the floors raised and your parlour floor, a step
 of 6 inches and 2 steps going into your new gallery of 5 inches a piece and to
 the chamber above the backhouse one step of 6 inches and out of your one
 chamber a step of 5 inches. The roof is taken down to the kitchen and we trust
 to set it up before Whitsuntide. As for the kitchen roof, it will be after the time
 20 or we take it down. We have had much labour of your screens. In the raising
 of your floors I trust we have saved all things well as yet and we have made 2
 partitions where the stairs shall be, but they are not set up and as for your
 screens in the hall, I trust at our coming up to know and further of your
 pleasure. Thus the living Lord evermore keep you in health. From Burlay this
 15th of May, by your humble servant to command.
 25 John NORYS.

Appendix B No 2.

state of the estate Abrahams to Cecil 22 Nov 1557 [Lansdowne vol 3] (spellings modernized)

My duty considered and promised according as I am bounded - pleaseth your mastership to be advertised that the 19 of this month I received your trees by Walker to whom your mship hath been very good master and I am sorry if he was not able to persue your buisiness as he ment to have done and where as
 5 your mship either hath or will cause Mr Vincent to be spoken unto for some hedging stuff for your quick sets which are in good forwardness for West hath done in the nether close - between Tykewood and the pale [inset above] - bochers¹ and in the heth close / so much as is requisite and Bardall hath done in
 1 0 stakes set between my mistress² close and the height of the hill towards the great wood ranging over at the least v or vj lees ³/ but as I remember your mastership said that the hedge should come directly up ij lees from my mistress' close to the check / and not over the lees / your pleasure herein is to be known and hedging from your owne woods can not be carried being to so far / men
 1 5 being almost wearied with carrage of stone whereof I ernst by god's help which if the weather do persue us to make an end about the 4th of December for the ground work of all cdi [401] acres except is digged and filled Holmes this week has been sick which hath much hindered the works -When the swans [?] are fat I shall as I may sell one of them / I can not speak for Mr Barnes for the xl
 2 0 shillings for your fee at Gretteford / he lieth at vady [?] where Mr Halles household is kept I have sent to him for it - your Jenet⁴ is and shall be both favoured and foddered as well as we can do it for so he hath need / I beseech you let us have either the grey or bay mare to draw whereof we have much need

1 Bochers: presumably a corruption of Bocage or Boscage denoting woodland or a spinney or thicket (see also Fr. Bosquet, It. Bosco) (OED 1964)

2 Cecil's mother officially held the land at Burghley in trust which Cecil played upon when justifying himself merely as a tenant at Burghley (see Hatfield Mss C.P 151/140)

3 Lee: presumably a variant of 'lea','ley' or 'lay', a field lying uncultivated or laid down to grass. As Cecil was engaged in laying out a park at this time (see chapter 4) as well as farming sheep, the latter definition would be appropriate. (OED)

4 Jennet: small Spanish horse (OED)

and she not worth a penny [note in Cecil's hand in the margin 'ye mare it was
 2 5 not covered] Strenger is content that your mship shall have his colt for xx
 shillings and desires me to know your pleasure for he needeth the money / xx
 shillings your coltes shall be brought to Burgley when hard weather shall be
 come. I have spoken to law Baker [lawyer Baker] / for the sale of your wool I
 would it were gone for it is loss in it and the longer the more / if I can I will sell
 3 0 it the leantoo in the base court was covered ij weeks past [note in Cecil's hand
 in the margin "by Warde"] the masons at Clyff park have wrought up all the
 windows and will make and end of the rest by Christmas I have paid to Robert
 Yeoman [?] to pay to the masons xl shillings above xij dayees ago / he would
 have had xx shillings more as this bearer can tell Mynes is not able to persue
 3 5 the hop yard is dressed above two weeks ago / and the holes in the orchard are
 digged ready for fruit trees but none come to be set but ij dozen of crabbe tree
 storks that I caused to be gathered and set / and where as your mship gave
 orders to have the hedge in the west side of the orchard shrouded to have a walk
 under it / but whether you will have the north end towards the base court quick
 4 0 set or no I desire to know your pleasure. If no drove of cattle come this side of
 St Andrew's day I mean by God's leave to be at Spalding Fayre on St Nicholas
 day which is thought to be both a great and good fair to buy cattle at / the xix
 day of this month where your sheep drowne [drawn ?] and numbered and that
 was of young wethers xvij [17] ¹/ one ram
 4 5 / lambs with the tithe lambs whereof I wish you such increase as I would have
 of mine v^{xx} iiij [104]² and of ewes v^{xx} j [101] / and there are viij old ewes
 beside to be killed for your household so there remaineth to be kept in all for
 store near xj^{xx} ij [222] and I will buy some more for store if I see any
 pennyworth thus I beseech god to pleasure your mship and my good lady with
 5 0 all yours in health at Burghley the 22nd of November by yours to command my
 life during

J Abraham

¹ Wether: a castrated ram

² For an explanation of these numbers (eg.[v with xx over] + iiij (meaning 5x20+4)) see Hector 1988, 41)

Appendix B No 3

Transcript: Hatfield MSS: CP 214/103

memo to masons. 1558 [in Cecil's hand]

Wyndows reqsit. for my new buyldyngs in the frōnt .

- ij { In primis a wyndow of iij lighte in ye nether buylding ā/w
[accord with] the wyndow of my~ uncle davydes inner chamber.
Inp— an other wyndow in ye same lodging toward ye orchard
of iij lightes.
- ii { Inp— in ye upper part of ye same lodging a wyndow of iij
light to answ~ ye wyndow of ye pallett chamber within my
brother Hobbys cha[m]b[er]s.
- { Inp— ij wyndows of lyke iij lighte in ye same lodgyng
towards ye south lyke ye other Gallery wyndows.
- ij { Inp— above in ye gallery over ye same lodging first toward ye
est [east] y ['french' inserted above then scored through]
wyndow square of iij lighte answerable to ye other North west
gable.
- { Inp— ij other french wyndowes of lyke sorte of iij lightes a
pece in ye south gable of ye same place ov~ ye wyndows of ye
lodging und~ nethe
- j { Inp— in ye Gallery ov~ ye gilt chamber a fr. wy~dow of ij
lightes.

chymees for ye same

In primis in ye nether now [or new] lodgyng ↯ j mātell
and parrell.Inp— in ye upp lodgyng j mātell and parrell with ye
tonell in ye Gabell towards ye south.

wyndows for my other rāge uppo~
my garde~ [garden]

In primis a wyndow for
a wyndow of iij lightes for ye pallett chāber next
to ye p'vees [privys]

Inp— one wyndow of lyke iij lights for ye bedd chāber
next to it.

Inp— a high wyndow for ye chappell.

Inp— the baye wyndow to serve ye grete chāber.

Inp— a~ oth~ wyndow of iij lightes for ye nether end
of ye gr chamber.

Inp— a wyndow of iij lightes for ye entry.

Inp— a wyndow of iij lights for ye stayres.

Appendix B No 4

A memorial written by Cecil gives a unique glimpse of his method of organising work to be done on his house and estate. It is dated 28th March, calendared 1561 and is in the form of a roughly two-columned two sheet list of things to be done, many of them scored through, no doubt indicating that they have been achieved or dealt with.

The first sheet includes the following:-

to cause Ward make a platt of my cowrt of husbandry.	to make answer for ye hangings at Grymsthorp.
to make a platt of my orchard	to send for ye glasier to cause ye ty~ber at St Lenardes to be viewed and p/ed [passed] and Robert Hall to be payd therfore
to remove ye stuff in ye gre[at] chamber. to make a book for St Lenards. to fell vj okes in E/ynde [Essenden?] after ye hollydaye. to mesure from ye condutt to Burley. to serche for a quarry in ye oke close. to mark ye 8 okes at [?] to clense ye orchard from thorns to remove ye gate to ye new way to apoynt ye new steare for ye gilt chamber	[various notes about properties leases etc.] to take order for the repair of my woods at Esyndon
to make ye way to ye nursery and b~ke house to fill up ye [^ ?] places in ye trees of ye base court to make a floore over ye cha[mber] over ye backhowse. to sowe ye terrass with hoydust	to ride to Collyweston.
8 okes at Stamford milne	
	. . for carr[iage] of my plaster to Sewstern .
for my courte at Thorp achirch to wryt	my ty~ber [timber] fro Eybury my ty~b from Woodhead /stones to be gath[ered] upp /in ye upper part of ye orchard
ye cartes of Tynwell[?] to bring home my sto[ne] fro St Peters	hopp poles j load in Cliff pk [park] j load in Woodh[ead].

on the following sheet (recto), including:-

In primis for ye Rough maso~s

to make my seates at ye iij trees	/to make upp ye dore into my wiffes gallery
to py upp ye garde[n] doore	/to make a portill at my orchard
to begy the chyneis [chimneys] in ye new lodgings	to make upp ye gate at ye orchard into ye drye close

to sett out ij syttying places in ye terrass wall

Inp^ for my carpy~tors.

to make ye ptitio [partition] and dore in ye nursery/ to make ye pti^tio [partition]
at ye doore/ to make a floore over ye armory
a new steare for ye gilt chamber

Inp^ for Ward to make a platt for my court of husbandry.

my rentall of Wykes to be showed by Abraham to Ta~pro~ /ye ty~ber at St lenards to be viewed by Norr. and p/ed.[passed]	for a corne barne/	a haye barne/	a husb. stable
	a brew howse/	a horse milne/	ij pooles
	a dove cote/	swyne howses./	hovelle for cartes./

Inp^ to apoynt ye Jack for ye mayd chamber

Inp^ to apoynt ye jackes for ye servants abood

Inp to clense ye terrass and sowe it with hoydust

to carry out my Cools [coals] into ye hovell / to take away ye
ptitio^ wall./

to make a platt of my orchard./

to see my woode at Est./ to send to Collyweston.

to send for a slator	to send to Gry~sthorp for ye hangings	to cutt ye mollhills in ye orchard.
----------------------	---------------------------------------	--

On the reverse of the sheet including:-

to fell trees for planks for my fynt^[furniture]
to fell young trees for my terrass
to send for ye glasier

to Mr Hobby } my coche/
lockes

nayles wey^scott [wainscott] sawe

a horse lyttr